Universalist Historical Society.
214

Bot for the Univ Hist Soc

1842

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE,

AND

IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR,

DEVOTED TO THE CAUSE OF

Religious Improvement.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?—HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?——*Mal.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

Volume VII.

Auburn, N. Y.

PUBLISHED BY U. F. DOUBLEDAY.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

1829.

Table of Contents.

SERMONS.	Page.
I. By O. A. Brownson—Matt. xxv. 46	1
II. By O. A. Brownson—Prov. iii. 17	17
III. By O. A. Brownson—Mark xvi 16	33
IV. By O. A. Brownsen—Jer. xxiii. 28	49
V. By A. H. Curtis—Rom. ii. 4	65
VI. By L. S. Everett—Ezk xviii. 20	81
VII. By O. A. Brownson—Isaiah xxviii 15	97
VIII. By L. S. Everett—Joshua xxii. 11, 12	113
IX. By Barzillai Streeter—Eccl. xii. 5	129
X. By O. A. Brownson—James iii. 17	147
XI. XII. XIII. XIV. By Menzies Rayner—Matt. xxv. 46 163. 179. 195.	211
XV. By O. A. Brownson—Hab. iii. 17, 18.	227
XVI. By Thos. Whittemore—Luke xvi. 19, 31	243
XVIII. By Samuel Brimblecom—Joshua xv. 8	275
XIX. By O. A. Brownson—Psalms i. 3	291
XX. By O. A. Brownson—Prov. xix. 3	307
XXI. By D. Skinner—1 Pet. iii. 18	323
XXII. By L. S. Everett—Rom. xii. 10	339
XXIII. By O. A. Brownson—Matt. xvii. 20	355
XXIV. By D. Skinner—Psalms cxxxii. 13, 14, 15, 17	371
XXV. By L. S. Everett—Matt. vi. 9	387
XXVI. By L. S. Everett—John viii. 36	403

EDITORIAL.

Essays on Christianity 7, 20, 36, 54, 68, 85, 102, 117,	134
To our readers	9
Sellons Sermons	10
Circular to Post Masters	11
Remarks on do.	12
Orthodox Ambition	12
To Correspondents	15, 31
Additional Agents	15, 31, 79
"A strange thing"	23, 39, 69, 305
Mr. Rains' Communication, notice of	25
Our Western Subscribers	31
Albany Christian Register, notice of	41
Sunday affairs	42
Clerical influence	42
Free Meetings Advocate, notice of	48
Sunday Memorial	56
Notice of the New-York Gospel Herald	59, 123
Questions for the Rochester Observer	70
Free Enquirers	80
Baptism	90
The times	103, 136, 280
To the leading Orthodox Clergy	105
Rev. Abner Kneeland	106
Letter from do.	209
Remarks on the Albany Christian Register	107
Infidelity	121
O. A. B. to James Luckey	127, 176, 186, 234
A question proposed	138
Church and State	139, 240, 251, 265, 284, 298
Vindication of Universalism	140
Sundry articles	151, 152, 201, 220
Review of Amicus	169, 216, 265
My creed	199
Fourth of July	218
Evangelical Magazine	219
Mr. Reese's Letters, notice of	236, 264
Controversy	242
Let us be vigilent	250
Miss Frances Wright, notice of	253
Let us awake	283
Mr. Brimblecom's Sermon, notice of	287
Weakness	299
Early Christians	300
Christian Intelligence—Mission of Christ	301
A Gospel Creed	310
Letter from the Editor	329, 344
Union of papers—New Arrangement	330, 362
Universalism in Albany	362
U. F. D.'s remarks on leaving out the name of O. A. B. as Editor	369
From the Cayuga Patriot	378
Explanation of 2 Thess. ii. 11 & 12 v.	385
To our Agents and Patrons	395
U. F. D.'s remarks on the course pursued by O. A. B.	396, 402
U. F. D.'s remarks on communication furnished by O. A. B.	409, 117

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

Christianity	12, 73
Mr. Rains' Letter	25, 42
An essay on Divine Goodness	38, 87, 119, 135, 294
A Letter to the Editor from J. R. R.	60
"To whom shall we go"—A. H. C.	71
Letter to the Editor from Mark Daniels	74
Letter from E. P. jr., Chardon, O.	77
Mr. Badger and Mr. Stow's Letters	91, 108
Orthodoxy and Paganism—A. C.	125
James Luckey to O. A. B.	152, 190
Letters to the Editor from Amicus	154, 174, 202, 268
Perseverance of the Saints—A. C.	156
Communication from a "Friend to Truth"	158
Service to God	167, 184
Communication from A. C.	190
To the Editor from Z. Townsend	192
Minutes of the Black River Association	221
To Elder Ichabod Clark of Scipio—Marcus	224
Letters from W. I. Reese to the Editor	231, 270
A Letter from the Auburn Seminary	271
Extract of a Letter dated New-York	271
Extract of a Letter dated Ohio	272
Conscience	297
Communicated from Indianapolis, Indiana	302
Inspiration—Moses and Jesus Christ	319
Minutes of the Cayuga Association	331
Thoughts on taking away the sin of the world	332

	Page.
Queries	334
An Unfeeling Outrage	335
H. Roberts to the Genesee Association	359
Extract from Frances Wright's Lecture	360
Letter from A. C. Thomas	362
Universalist Hymn book—Ancient History of Universalism	377
On the New Birth	377
Minutes of the Genesee Association	391
Proceedings of a public meeting at Caroline	407

MISCELLANY.

Attention the Universe	14
Publick Meeting at Batavia	27
More Petitions	30
Resignation	30
A Fragment	44
Suffering for Christ's sake	45
Johnson's Report	45
Post Master General's Letter	48
Mr. Madison's Memorial and Remonstrance	61
A Dream	75
Extract from the Black book by Mrs. Royal	78
Notice of Religious Inquirer, priestcraft exposed and Star in the West	79
Progress of Truth	95
Death of Rev. John Bisbe	107
Orthodoxy	111, 142
The Mallstown Whirlpool	111
Effects of the Limitarian Creed—Post Office in London—Church and State	143
Faith and Love, J. Chase, jr.	160
Forgiveness of sins—Horrid Impiety	172
Sundry articles	173, 174, 400, 401
A Card	178
Several Notices	193, 194
Free Enquiry	205
Long Prayers	207
On Slavery	208
Mississippi valley	209
Fate, a Fragment	223
Of Religion and Irreligion	254
Meeting of Freemen	255
First Universalist Preacher	257
Address delivered on the 4th of July, 1829, by Robert Dale Owen	259
Religion	272
Questions—Existence of God	274
The Crisis—Hell, Where is it—Begging—Going to Church	289
Mission of Christ	295
Charity misapplied	301
Virginia Awake	302
Mrs. Royal and the Court at Washington—her address	304
Henry M'Causland	312
American Sunday School Union	313
An unfortunate situation	314
On original sin	315
Character of Petitioners	317
Chenango Association—"Tracts Blessed"	318
Sisters and Mothers—Jewish Law	318
Unparalleled Outrage	336
Suicide at Woburn, Mass.—Caution to Universalists	337
Conversion in the ministry—Spirit of Orthodoxy	337
General Convention, Proceedings of	345
Spiritual condition of infants	348
Church and State—Money not Bibles—Col. R. M. Johnson—Avarice outwitted	351
Beggars without shame—Sabbath School Instructions	352
Men raised by merit	353
Misstatement corrected	363
Miss Wright, notice of	364
Are Unitarians Universalists	365
Infrequency of revivals—Sunday Mails	366
American Bible Society—Like for Like	367
Tracts—Modern History of Universalism	368
Union of papers, new arrangement	369, 385, 402, 418
Letter from Rev. H. Ballou to Rev. Dr. Beecher	380
Short Sermon	381
Sunday Mails	382
Sabbath Mails	383
A Miracle—The last new invention	383
Life before the flood—Variety store	384
Illustration of 1 John ii. 18, 19	395
Articles of faith adopted by the presbytery of Niagara	398
Orestes A. Brownson	411
Theism	413
Tracts—Infant Schools	415

POETRY.

The Butterfly—Creeds—Woman's Love—Farewell to a Friend	16
Euphrates—Stanzas—Hebrews	32
The spirit's land	48
Benevolence by J. M. D.—Life	80
Friendship, selected for the Advocate—Mary's tears—Life's Sunny spots—The Dying Mother—To my little Sister	96
The worn sail—On a Sailor's funeral at sea—The bride maid—A dream	112
Stanzas by J. M. D.	128
The Sleepers—Death of a Man of God—The Wife—Fragment	146
Song of the Spring—Stanzas by J. M. D.	162
Discretion by J. M. D.	178
On the death of Laodicea Slayton	194
Dialogue—Jewett	210
The raising of Lazarus	226
The stranger and his friend—The sisters	238
The Indian with his dead child—God is good	290
The Cherokee's reply—Stanzas—Take back the Bowl—I speak not—I trace not	306
And they sung a new song—Feats of Death—The autumn flower	322
My mountain home—Stanzas—Lines written on the blank leaf of a young Lady's Bible—Byron	338
Mere Philosophy—I do not ask	354

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, JANUARY 10, 1829. [NO. 1.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON

On future Judgement and punishment.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

Delivered at Genoa, on the evening of the third Sabbath in December, 1828.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

"These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."—Matt. xxv. 46.

My Brethren:—An important subject is selected for our consideration this evening.—Important, not only in itself considered, but important, from the degree of interest which most feel in its discussion, and from the overwhelming influence which mankind have allowed it to have in producing their happiness or misery.

Since I have commenced my labours in the vineyard of my Divine Master, the passage, which I have just pronounced in your hearing, has been repeatedly brought forward to prove that, at some future day, when the final judgement shall be declared, a large part of the human family will be driven away into endless punishment. To inquire how far this passage countenances such a doctrine, and how far we are authorized, from revelation and from reason, to believe in a judgement in the world to come and in the sentiment of endless misery, usually connected with it, is the object of our discourse.

Man, it has been said, is naturally a religious being. And indeed, in all ages and in all countries of the world, he seeks to himself some object of religious veneration. To this object with all its imaginary qualities, he ascribes the name God. Every man has his god, and a god too, unlike the god of his neighbour. Hence wars, a variety of crusades, are carried on under the auspices of contending deities. The attributes of these gods, are generally fashioned after those of their worshippers; sometimes characterized by a love of power; by "rage, revenge or lust;" sometimes they are represented as weak, passionate, repenting of their own, or their people's conduct; grieving at the ill success of creation, and determined to blast it in their wrath.

Sometimes these gods are fancied to roam the aerial regions—sometimes to dwell on Olympus' top—in the sun, moon, or stars, in the fire or in the water. Sometimes they are considered as *incarnate*. Then they are represented as occasionally assuming the form of a beast, bird, man, fish, reptile or insect.—Thus do men's imaginations run. Hence the variety and discordance of their religious opinions.

Man has a desire for happiness. It is the first principle developed in his nature—one which "grows with his growth and strengthens with his strength." But this desire is often frustrated. The rude hand of some intermeddling stranger destroys his happiness; and often, very often, he sees one revelling in possessions which belonged to him, which belonged also to the orphan and the widow. Can this be right? Unfortunately every one believes himself to be the most miserable, and every one else to be more happy. Dissatisfied with his own lot, he looks with envy on his neighbour, and dreams his own unhappiness is owing to the injustice or oppression of others. Full of this conviction he looks forward to another world and exclaims, "a day of recompense shall come—a day shall come, when the poor shall be rewarded and the rich shall be punished—when I shall soar to the blissful mansions of my God, but when all that have been inimical to my happiness, shall sink to everlasting night—to wretchedness beyond conception." Hence the origin of the notions of heaven and of hell. "One was built on spite, the other on pride."

Pride flattered his hopes. No matter what his condition; the greater his sufferings here, the surer his claim to heaven hereafter; and should he be compelled to endure the fatigues of war—should he fight bravely, or die gloriously in combat with his brother, he should triumph in the world to come;—he should enter the fair fields of Elysium, where the inhabitants are blest with a serener air, a brighter sun and a milder moon; where he can enter the ring, contend in the race, and have the immortal coursers roll his swift-wheeled chariot withersoever he please; where he may bask in eternal youth upon the green, sunny banks, in the fields of the blest, and have his heart soothed, his senses gratified, as the smoke of his enemies' torment ascends like sweet incense forever and ever.

On the other hand, revenge thundered forth, "depart from me ye cursed—ye have had

your good things and I my evil things; situations are now altered, and eternity shall be too short to glut my wrath. May the curses of Omnipotence rest upon your heads and sink you to the nethermost hell." Hence the idea of separation in the human family—a separation made by the passions, and if clerical zeal can be trusted, one which will take place between brethren, and be eternally continued.

And strange to tell, even at this day of science and boasted humanity—at this age distinguished for its *Christian* enterprize, when both clergy and people are proclaiming, from one end of the world to the other, their love for souls—at this day big with such mighty designs and overflowing with such ardent desires for the salvation of men, we are taught to fall back with horrour from the vivid descriptions of that awful day, "for which all other days were made." At midnight, it is said, when soft sleep infuses her vivifying balm through man's weary limbs; at this hour of repose and solemn stillness, when the world is wrapt in slumber and silence starts at her own echo, the archangel's trump, followed by the crash of worlds, shall summon all the nations of the living and the dead, before the dread tribunal! Amid the thunders, the flames and terrours of the universal conflagration, the awful Judge, with lightnings playing no his countenance, assumes his seat upon his stupendous throne seated in the air. Heaven and earth have passed away;—trembling before their angry Judge stand the guilty nations, while blackened angels wait the signal to enforce the dread decree and hurl them down to eternal woe!

To such frightful scenes are fanaticism and clerical zeal constantly pointing our imaginations; and such the awful doom which our spiritual guides are continually fulminating in our ears. But thanks be to God, they now serve to excite no other emotions in persons of good sense than mere pity for the fulminators. I pity the man, from my heart I pity the man, who thinks to make me believe that eternal torture will be the doom of all who have too much discernment to subscribe to the senseless jargons of our creed-makers, and of those who attempt to guide our souls.

An endless hell may be my doom—my eternal dwelling place; but if any one wishes me to believe it, he must no longer tell me of a God whose nature is love—of a Saviour who is both able and willing to save to the uttermost, nor assure me that this Savionr will ride forth conquering and to conquer; that his march shall be glorious, his reign prosperous, and that "he will not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgement in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law." For, while I am taught to believe this, I can never believe that eternal woe will be the portion of any of the human family.

But, here I am assailed with the passage selected for my text, and which, when read with its connection, is said to expressly state the doctrine which I oppose. But to this I object,

1. There is nothing in the text nor its context which even intimates that there will be a future state of existence; and therefore cannot be supposed to teach what shall there transpire.

2. There are no established principles from which such a doctrine can be inferred, and no passages of scripture which directly teach it. And,

3. The passage predicted events which have long since taken place, consequently cannot teach what is yet future.

I. The passage selected for our text is at the end of an interesting portion of scripture; but it says nothing about another world. There is nothing in the text or its context which says any thing about what is to transpire after death. Several events are predicted which are to take place at a certain time, but it does not assert that time is in another state of existence. Several commentators, as well Limitarian as Universalist, have applied it to events of this life, and I am confident no just criticism can determine it to any other.

Our reason can give us no information respecting what shall be after death. All our knowledge of another world is derived from revelation; and it is, I believe, a law of criticism, that all passages relating to that world should be strictly construed. What scripture says respecting that world, is decisive. We are at liberty to make no additions nor diminutions. The same law also forbids us to apply to that world any passage of scripture which does not expressly mention it, or is not expressly declared to belong to that world, either by some passage found in the context or elsewhere. The propriety of this rule is easily discovered. Were we at liberty to apply any passage to that world we chose, we might have as many different views of that world as there are different passages in the bible. Suppose a judge was trying a man for murder, and suppose he should admit as conclusive evidence that the man had murdered, the testimony which only proved he had killed, without specifying what he had killed, what would you think of his discernment? The witness is brought forward: "Did you see this man kill another man?" The witness answers, "I saw him *kill*," and this is taken as conclusive evidence in the case when perhaps in fact, it was only a wild beast he had killed.

Thousands are equally absurd in their interpretations of the bible. Admit the paragraph, of which our text is a part, speaks of a *judgement*. You assert there is a judgement in the world to come; you interrogate this paragraph: "is there a judgement in the other

world?" The paragraph answers, "there is a *judgement*;" but does not determine it is here or somewhere else. To infer absolutely from this testimony, with no other authority, that the judgement is in another world, would betray our weakness and our entire ignorance of the rules of evidence.

But this paragraph does not even assert that there is, or will be, a judgement, much less does it inform us it will be after death. And, as no one has a right to apply it to another world, unless he can bring some passage of scripture which expressly states it; and, as no such passage can be produced, we are justified in saying it does not thus apply, or rather, it does not teach the doctrine it is adduced to prove. Nor can it alter this conclusion, by saying the passage is unintelligible or any other hypothesis. We have no right to invent hypotheses and then bring passages of scripture to support them. If the sentiment we attempt to maintain is not supported by unequivocal reasoning, we are not authorized to support it by ambiguous texts. My ignorance of the meaning of any passage of scripture, is no argument, that it means what another person supposes. He, who brings forward a text to prove any point of doctrine, must bring a text which expressly states the point, or he must show beyond the power of controversy, that the text does absolutely prove it by implication. The passage under consideration is said to apply to another world. This is denied, because the passage does not mention another world, nor even intimate that there will be another world. He, who asserts this passage does thus apply, must prove it by some positive declaration of scripture, or his assertion is not to be received. If he, to prove the assertion, tells me I cannot understand the passage, or derive any meaning from it, unless I admit that for which he contends, it makes no difference. My ignorance or my inability is no proof of his correctness. Look at the subject in what light you please and you must admit our first objection. The passage does not apply to another world.

II. There are no established principles from which such a doctrine can be inferred, and there are no passages of scripture which directly teach it. This position we think is correct. But we ask, from what principles shall we infer a future judgement? From its utility? What is its use? Judgements, or courts, among men are necessary for the detection and suppression of crime. But this necessity arises from our ignorance and from our inability to be in every place at the same time. Were our knowledge so enlarged that we could, at all times and without any process of thinking, detect the criminal and the crime, and were the authority necessary to suppress the crime committed and prevent the injury from spreading, at all times present when the iniquity was done, there would be no necessity for a judgement to be held. But this is not the case with mankind. The crime is committed in the dark. The criminal is often unknown and must be ferretted out; and his guilt established by the testimony of witnesses. But will any one say this is necessary with him who knows his works from the beginning to the end, whose eye pierces through nature and with one glance comprehends the whole? Is he under the necessity of instituting a formal process? Must he make inquiry, who has committed a crime or how much guilt attaches itself to particular individuals? And is he, who is omnipotent and is every where present, unable to suppress crime without this grand assize? Will he require the aid of witnesses? will he need the aid of executioners to inflict the punishments which he shall, after due inquiry and mature deliberation pronounce upon his offending children?

Again: If popular sentiment be correct there can be no utility in this judgement day. It is, I believe, orthodox to say, when a man dies his state is fixed, his doom determined, for there is no change after death. All say of a friend, when he is dead, they hope he has gone to heaven, or they fear he has gone to hell. Did he go to either without its being determined which he was deserving? Suppose a sinner died four thousand years ago, where was he sent? Orthodoxy says "to hell." Suppose at the same time a saint died, where did he go? Orthodoxy answers, "to heaven." Did they go without being judged? Will God have to review his judgement? or does he take one to heaven and send another to hell, without determining which place either is deserving? And if he judges once, will he find cause to reverse that judgement on a review? Will he find some wicked fellow has been allowed to creep into heaven, when he ought to have been sent to hell, or that some unfortunate being has been burning in hell four thousand years, who ought to have been receiving the joys of heaven? No. What then will be the use of the vast convocatory of all the human family on that awful day? and what will be the use of the grand assize?—Perhaps to make a great display. We can assign no other reason. This is indeed characteristick of Orthodoxy. She attempts something great, grand and awful. The noise she makes, her vast preparations, and magnificent apparatus, lead us to expect something mighty, but she is the mountain in the fable.

Parturiunt montes nascitur ridiculus mus.

Passing this by, perhaps it will be said, we are *probationers* here, and it will be necessary, after the term of trial is over, to look at the books and see how much we owe, or how much is due to us. But it would seem, that the business might as well be done with each individual as he finished his probation, as to

keep him in waiting until all have ended their term. But that *we are* probationers, is asserted indeed, but not proved. It is said we are placed here on trial, and that, after this time is over, we shall be examined as to the course we pursued, and be rewarded or punished as that was good or bad.

But how long does this probation last? Say during life; that

> "Life is the time to serve the Lord,
> The time t' insure the great reward;
> And, while the lamp holds out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return."

But why this inequality? why do not all have the same time? Here is a young man, who had but just commenced his sinful course. He was cut off in the commission of his first sinful act and has gone to hell. There is an old man, who has spent fourscore years in the practice of iniquity. His heart is black with crime, and his hands red with blood. But he repents five minutes before his death, comes in at the last division of the eleventh hour—he goes to heaven. Which of these two was the greatest sinner? which deserved the hottest hell, he who had committed but one sin, or he who had spent eighty years in the practice of sin? O, orthodoxy, thou art admirable for thy justice! But why not let them both have an equal chance? The old man had been preserved until he repented, and he is now praising God. Had he died at middle age he would have gone to hell, but his life was spared, and he is happy. Had the youth been permitted to live—had his life been preserved as long as was the other's, he too might have repented, and been now mingling his praises with angels around the throne of the Almighty.

But again: How will this principle of probation correspond with the doctrine of salvation by grace? The probationary scheme supposes a man is judged according to his works, and that he will go to heaven or to hell, as his works have been good or bad. But scripture assures us that salvation is by grace; that "eternal life is the gift of God;" that "it is not of him that willeth nor him that runneth, but of God who showeth mercy."

But once more concerning this future judgement: There are no passages of scripture which directly teach it. There are several passages which speak of a "judgement," and of a "day of judgement," but there are none which positively assure us that this judgement is after death. Hebrews ix. 27, and Rev. xx. 12, 13, may seem to be exceptions to this remark. But a bare reading of the chapter which contains the first, will convince any discerning mind, that Paul is speaking of the high priest's dying in his sacrifice, and that he is drawing a parallel between the high priest, after the order of Aaron, and of Jesus, who was made a priest after the order of Melchesideck. Paul assures us, it was appointed unto men once to die, that is, for men who are made priests it is appointed to die; [by the sacrifice of a goat every year before the high priest could enter into the holy of holies which was the judgement;] so Christ was once offered, and has now entered, not into the holy of holies made with hands which are but the patterns of the true, but into the heavens, where he liveth to make intercession for us; and we trust so powerful an advocate will obtain judgement in our favour. See Rom. v. 18. Of the second, it is enough to remark, that it is found in the book of Revelation—a book which nobody does or can understand.

The Revelation is a dark book. It is mostly figurative; and a large part of it seems calculated to mock the genius of man by forever eluding his grasp. The passage in question is highly figurative; it is from one of the most highly figurative books in the bible, and let it mean what it may, it is not, in our opinion, sufficient to establish a doctrine so highly important as the one under consideration. Moreover, there is good reason to consider this passage refers to the same event, and that it is of nearly the same import with our text, in which case, the observations we have to make under our last general head, will serve to explain it.

But, even admitting there will be a future judgement, it by no means follows as a necessary consequence, that any of the human family will be everlastingly miserable. We know of no principles from which endless misery can be inferred. Shall we infer it from the character of God? He is "love." "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour." It is not the nature of love to make its object miserable. God is our Creator. If our creation is a benefit to us, God was good in making us. But if our creation prove a curse, as it must, in case we are endlessly miserable, he was not good but cruel in giving us existence. When he made us he must have known what would be the consequence of our being made. And, if we are endlessly miserable, we shall not be able to excuse him of cruelty; for if he made us with the knowledge that such would be our doom, it is a fair presumption that he designed it. Had he not designed it, he would not have made us, unless he was compelled so to do. It will not obviate the difficulty, to say we make ourselves miserable; for we have no power for that purpose except what he has given us; and why did he put the instrument of death into our hands, when he knew we should use it to our own destruction, unless he designed that we should destroy ourselves? Shall we infer it from the nature of justice? What is justice? Let it be what it may, if we know any thing about it, it cannot inflict more evil than it overbalances with good. The only claim which any being can have on another, is in consequence of benefits conferred. It is therefore evident that the claim cannot exceed

the amount of good bestowed; and, as it would be madness, as Archbishop Tillotson well observes, to pretend that the simple blessing of existence is equal to a whole eternity of pain, we think justice will not allow Deity to make any of his creatures eternally miserable. Shall we infer that mankind will be endlessly miserable from the *nature* of punishment? All punishment, in order to be just, if indeed there can be any punishment that is just, *must* be inflicted for the good of the punished, for his reformation,* consequently, cannot be endless, unless God fails in his designs, or is unable to accomplish the end he proposes. See Heb. xii. 5—11:

But it is said, "these [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment." Be it so. It is not said how long they shall remain there. It does not say these shall be everlastingly *punished*; but these shall go away *into* everlasting punishment. The punishment may remain; but there is no assurance that any of the same individuals, who go away *into* it, shall eternally remain in it. This punishment may be a means used by Deity to purify the soul; and when the soul becomes purified, it may be delivered from it. But others may be cast into it, and generation after generation may be purified with the same fire and be delivered, but the punishment or fire may remain eternally.

But setting this aside, the word everlasting is ambiguous, or at least, it does not always have the same meaning. As a general rule, its meaning must be ascertained from the nature of the subject to which it is applied. But we have already discovered the *nature* of punishment is necessarily limitted; therefore, the term *everlasting* in our text, cannot mean endless duration. But more of this before we close.

III. The passage selected for our text and its connections, speak of events long since past, consequently cannot teach what is yet future. The paragraph, of which our text is the close, commences at the 31st verse and predicts the coming of Christ in the glory of his Father—the separating of one nation from another—placing the righteous on his right hand and the wicked on his left—welcoming those on the right to the kingdom of his Father, and sending those on the left into everlasting fire. Five questions arise: 1. When are these events to take place? 2. Who are those placed on the right hand? 3. Who are those placed on the left? 4. What is the kingdom or eternal life, into which the righteous are welcomed? And 5. What is the everlasting punishment into which the wicked go away?

We must touch these questions with all possible brevity. The first is the most important; for when we have answered that, we have a clue by which to unravel all the mystery there may be in the rest. When were these events to transpire? We answer—when Christ came to reward every man according to his works. But when was this coming, or when shall it be? It was in the lifetime of some that heard him speak. See Matt. xvi, 27, 28—Mark, viii. 28, ix. 1—Luke, ix. 26, 27. More conclusively, see Matt. xxiii. and xxiv. In the 23d chapter Christ had been pronouncing some heavy woes upon the Jews, and concluded with the remark that their house was left to them desolate; and that they should not see him henceforth until they should say, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.—In the 24th, we are informed, his disciples came to him to point out the buildings of the temple; but he remarked they should be thrown down and not one stone should be left upon another. His disciples privately ask him, saying, When shall these things be? what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world, or more properly of the age? He bids them beware of being deceived, for many should come in his name, and would deceive many. He speaks of wars and rumours of wars, of distress and tribulation, such as had not been since the beginning of time; no, nor ever should be again. And *immediately after the tribulation* of those days the sun should be darkened, the moon should not give her light, the stars should fall from heaven and the powers of the heavens should be shaken; and they should see the sign of his coming, and all the tribes of the earth should mourn, and they should see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. The 34th verse assures us that the time of all these events, viz. the tribulation, the darkening the sun and the moon, the falling of the stars, the shaking of the powers of heaven, the sign and coming of the Son of Man, should be in the life time of some who were then living. "*Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass until all these things be fulfilled.*"

If his words mean what they say, they clearly and unequivocally prove that his coming was in that generation in which he spoke. I conclude, therefore, the coming, to which he refers, was his coming by his power or spirit, leading his mighty messengers, to wit, the Roman army, to the destruction of Jerusalem. For we find from history, that Jerusalem was taken and the Temple burned by the Romans under Titus, son of Vespasian, about forty years after the death of Christ, consequently while many of them who heard the Saviour of the world, might be living. And indeed, we are informed that John did survive that sad catastrophe of the Jewish nation, and that he wrote his gospel after that event. Hence,

* On punishment, see sermon 24th, 6th volume, Gospel Advocate; and also Essayist, No. 6, same volume, No. 14.

probably, the reason he does not relate this prediction of Christ. Hence too, the meaning of the promise made to the disciple whom Jesus loved. "If I will that he *tarry until I come.*" See the last chapter of John, which has puzzled many a commentator; and many an honest Christian has tried to make himself believe that John is still alive. Corroborative of this conclusion, the vii. chapter of Daniel, xiii. of Mark, the xxi. of Luke, i. of 2nd Thessalonians, and xx. of Revelation, with many other passages which I have not time to adduce. We determine the time when these events were to transpire, to be at the destruction of Jerusalem when Christ came to take vengeance on the unbelieving Jews. Having thus fixed the time of his coming, we may inquire, secondly, who were those placed on his right hand?

The re are three classes mentioned in the text. 1. Christ's brethren, whom I consider to be h is immediate disciples. 2. Those who admini stered to their wants, who were probably bel lievers, whether Jews or Gentiles. 3 Those who refused to administer to their wants. These we believe were the Jews—the unbelie ving part. That those, who were placed on the ri ght hand, or those who were welcomed to the k ingdom, were believers we conclude all are re eady to admit; therefore we shall not labour to prove it.

3. Wh o were those placed on the left hand? The Jew s as a nation. They, as a nation, rejected Ch rist, crucified him, and refused to administer to the wants of his disciples, and persecuted them from city to city. The Jews, as a natio n, were rejected—degraded from their rank of chosen people and driven away in blindnes s of mind; and have been subject to shame a nd contempt from that time to this. The expres sion, "Depart ye cursed," is only equivalent t o, Depart ye rejected; and as we know the Jew s were rejected, and as we know the Gentiles could not generally at that time, be guilty of the neglect to Christ's brethren which is alle dged, for these brethren had not been among t hem, we are convinced the Jewsh nation we re those who were placed on the eft hand, co nsequently they were the ones who "went away into everlasting punishment."

4. What w s the kingdom or eternal life hto which the righteous were welcomed?—The kingdom of Christ, or his mediatorial ingdom of div ine grace, full of life and comort to the believ er. Mark, Christ calls himelf "king;" "Then shall the *King* say," &c. ut he never, w hen addressing his disciples the Jews, ca lled himself king except on is occasion. H e indeed spoke of being born king, and he u sually referred to his kingm, which he assured the Jews was not of *is world.* He s poke while the Jewish world age was in exi stence; and when he said his kingdom was not of *this* world, he may be understood as meaning his kingdom or reign, did not commence till the Jewish should pass away. Hence he says, "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory—*then* shall he *sit* upon the throne of his glory;" which plainly implies this coming was the commencement of his reign. And this is another proof that the events of which we have been treating, took place at the time we have stated; and a strong argument against the orthodox notion, that they shall transpire at the consummation of all things; for then the Son gives up the kingdom, (see 1st Cor. xv. 24,) whereas it is here stated that they shall take place when he takes his seat upon the throne of his glory. We consider the separation spoken of, is the separation which took place between the Jews and believers, who, before the destruction of Jerusalem, had been confounded. The kingdom, prepared from the foundations of the world for the believer, is Christ's mediatorial kingdom; and the eternal life into which the righteous enter, is the life or felicity which flows from the reign of Christ to the believer. What this life or felicity is, is well known to every Christian. This kingdom is the kingdom of righteousness, the kingdom of heaven or of God, which Jesus declared to be at hand. See Mark i. 15. It is the kingdom which God gave his Son. Its extent may be learned from Daniel vii. 13, 14. This is not an endless kingdom; but it shall endure till Christ have put all things under his feet. Then he shall deliver it up to his Father and God shall be all and in all. See 1st Cor. xv. 28.

5. What is the punishment or everlasting fire into which the wicked go away? Blindness of mind, hardness of heart and remorse of conscience. What every one must feel who rejects Jesus the Saviour of men. The Jews were driven away in their unbelief; and the everlasting punishment they suffer, is the misery consequent upon the state of mind in which they were driven away. "But will they ever be saved?" Yes—"For I would not have you ignorant of this mystery, brethren, lest ye be wise in your own conceits." That blindness in part has happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, "there shall come out of Zion a deliverer who shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." See Paul to the Romans, xi.

The phrase—"*everlasting punishment*,"—would be more correctly understood, if its place were supplied by age-lasting correction, or perhaps still more accurately, by the "correction of the age;" that is, the chastisement of the Jewish age, or the misery which would fall upon those who should adhere to the Mosaick law after it was abrogated. Into this correction the Jews were driven away. They must endure it until the fulness of the Gentiles be

come in. Then they too, shall be brought in, Zion's harp shall be retaken from the willow, and songs of heaven-born love shall re-echo from her mountain tops forever and ever.

REMARKS.

I have now gone through my subject, presented it in as clear and convincing a light as the time allotted me would allow. Some points require a fuller discussion, and that we intend they shall hereafter receive. What is offered, is but a small part of what might be said. But it is submitted for your contemplation. It is your duty to read the scriptures for yourselves; and the convictions of your own minds, and not of mine, should regulate your faith and determine your religious character.

The sentiment of a future judgement, at which we have glanced, is yet extensively believed, but it has little more than heathenish tradition for its support. It originated in the metaphysical disquisitions of priests; aided by the passions, it has been fostered and preserved; and much improved in strength, it has been handed down to us as important to be embraced. But we look forward to a period when these dreams of ancient times, which now have so much power over us, will be dissolved; and man will become a rational and an independent being, capable of procuring happiness for himself and of doing good to his fellow men. The doctrine of endless misery has long been the bane of human felicity, and the great encourager of the baser passions of the soul. But we rejoice that the time is approaching, when men will think more honourably of God, and more benevolently of each other. When Jehovah will be considered the common Father and the common Friend of the human race; when mankind will be considered members of the same great family and be cherished by each other as brethren.

We acknowledge ourselves sinners, but believe the time is coming when each will be more anxious to correct his own errours, than he will be to threaten his brother with the wrath of God; when each one, becoming sensible of his own failings, will treat with forbearance his brother; and convinced that he is also a sinner, he will learn to spread the mantle of charity over the foibles and the faults of others.

That God will bring every secret act or thought into judgement, is a plain scripture doctrine and fundamental to the creed of the Christian. But that we must wait some thousand years to come before this judgement will take place, is but an imaginary notion, an errour which serves to strengthen the hands of the wicked, and to prevent his turning from his wicked way. "The *way* of the transgressor is hard." Let the sinner be taught this fact, and also be convinced that the ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness, and the world will reform; the joys of heaven will be anticipated; righteousness and peace will flow down our streets; the salvation of God will be revealed, and all flesh will see it together.

THEOLOGIA.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

INTRODUCTION NO. I.

So much has been written on the subject, which it is proposed to discuss in the following Essay, that I have no expectation of offering any thing new to those who have examined it. I lay no claim to extensive researches or profound erudition. I write not for the scholar nor for the theologian who has devoted his life to the study of christianity. My labours are designed for a different class of mankind—for those who depend more on their own reflections than they do on what they read, who study nature more than they do the ponderous tomes of polemical theology or of ancient systems of faith. I wish to aid such as these without diverting their attention from those avocations on which the subsistence of society immediately depends; to throw out some hints which may serve to guide their inquiries and direct the train of their reflections; to supply food for their meditations, and to lead them "through nature up to nature's God." In a word my object is to unite religion and common sense, two kindred spirits which have a natural fondness for each other, though unfortunately, the folly or perversity of mankind has long kept them separate.

The world has been overrun with systems of religion, which have commanded the applause of the multitude, without adding any thing to the knowledge or happiness of mankind; numerous theories have been advocated with all of human ingenuity; some perhaps have cast a few rays of light upon the dark habitation of man, but the sun of their glory has set in gloom, or been obscured by the clouds of bigotry which have been raised, or hidden by the storms of persecution which have been too often hurled against the heads of poor defenceless mortals. So many systems are now prevalent that inquiry is distracted and choice baffled. Pardon me—it is not my intention to add another, but if possible out of the surrounding chaos to bring something like order.

I have no wish to divide mankind, nor am I so vain as to attempt to unite them. Diversity of sentiment always has prevailed, and, for aught we know, always will. This may be regretted, but probably without reason. It prompts inquiry; gives energy as well as activity to the mind; prevents that monotony and that general stagnation of the intellectual stream, which would result, were mankind all of the same opinion.

Man is formed for action. When deprived of the privilege of exerting his power, or when condemned to the abode of indolence, he

wastes away without usefulness to himself or to others. Idleness is the heaviest burden he can bear; and entire freedom from care, anxiety and every kind of employment, probably the severest curse that could be inflicted to blight his being and to deprive him of every claim to rationality. He is not only capable of action, but his highest felicity is derived from the exertion of his active powers. But, to call forth this exertion, you must present him with some inducement to act. We soon become disgusted with the same routine of pursuits or of pleasure. Any object, no matter how good or how useful in itself considered, loses its value in our estimation, the moment the charms of novelty have faded and it becomes generally known and generally received.

Religion is admitted to be a thing of inestimable value, but it must vary its form, change its dress and its pretensions, hold out different rewards and punishments, or it will fail to interest the heart and command the attention. Our fathers had a religious creed, the best, no doubt, they could discover or receive; but to tell us that we must be satisfied with that creed, because it satisfied them, is to confess our ignorance of human nature as well as to suppose we have made no advances, that our minds are fashioned in the same mould with theirs, that our thoughts run in the same channel, and that our wishes point to the same objects, and that our desires will rest contented with their acquisitions. Such a supposition betrays a want of attention to what passes in our own minds and in the minds of others.

The Christians reverence the Bible, consider it an infallible rule of faith and practice; the Mahometan reveres the Koran, the Hindo the Vedes, the Parsee the Zendavesta, each prefers his own Bible and stigmatizes the others as infidels, obnoxious to the wrath of God. This, at first, might seem a real calamity, which has befallen the human race; and indeed we cannot withhold our regret that each should be so intolerant to the others. But perhaps more mature reflection will lead us to admire the impartiality and forbearance of the Great Father of all, who permits his children to choose their own mode of worship, and does not tie them down to the same tedious form, nor to the use of the same phraseology.

Christians are anxious to convert the world to their own faith; each sect is ambitious to have all embrace its peculiar creed: hence a spirit of proselytism prevails, and a continual collision of conflicting dogmas and contradictory interests is exhibited. And though I have imbibed, neither from nature nor from my religion, much zeal for proselyting, I do not regret such is the case with the world. If any one of the numerous denominations of religionists should gain the ascendency, and like Aaron's rod swallow the rest, the cause of truth and humanity might suffer; but while they are contending, the mind is acquiring strength; its mighty energies are awakened, called into action, and even from the collisions of erroneous theories truth may be elicited. Society is all life and vigour. And though the scene may seem painful to the casual observer, a close inspection will discover the angels of science, of virtue and felicity, rising from the midst of the contention and joyfully hovering over the contending parties. It is only necessary they should contend with less animosity; but angry and rough as their disputes are, it is better than it would be for mankind all to believe just alike. At first, no doubt, the novelty of the thing would make it extremely delightful, but that charm would soon disappear and intellect would fall asleep, for there would be nothing to keep it awake. Society would become dull and uninteresting, for there would be little to give it life or mental activity.

I have therefore no wish to reduce all mankind to the same opinion. It is better they should disagree, as life without variety would be a "dull dunce" scarcely worth possessing. The most that can be desired, is, that they should be persuaded to lay aside that animosity which embitters their controversies, and a little of that exclusive spirit which characterizes their conduct. If they could be persuaded to impose a curb upon their impetuous passions which too often run away with their senses, and consent calmly to investigate their own and others opinions, it is highly probable, their disquisitions would be attended with less confusion and with more advantage to the cause of truth. The philanthropist may labour, with propriety, to blunt the points of contact, and to enable each individual to support, or strive to support, his own creed without infringing the rights of others. I have this object in view, and if I accomplish it I shall think my labour will not be in vain, and my readers time will not be misspent.

In our inquiry, we shall attempt to cultivate an acquaintance with human nature, rather than with the Divine, and to smooth the rugged features of the earth, rather than to ensure heaven for our souls hereafter. The value of a system of religion will be determined from its utility to man; and its correctness, in a great measure, from its agreement with the various phenomena of nature in general and with man in particular. Man himself is to be considered not merely as an animal that is born to propagate his species and then return to his native dust. He lays claim to nobler and more sublime faculties. He is an intellectual being, capable of many elevated conceptions and noble achievements. He is not confined to the little spot of earth where he dwells; he can send his thoughts abroad, cull the pleasures of distant regions and regale himself with the intellectual riches

of every age. He can rise from this contracted globe, where destiny has confined his body, to contemplate worlds where his feet have never wandered, and to hold communion with that great and good Being, who, though invisible himself, displays the glories of his Divinity through all the wonderful productions of nature.

Not merely as intellectual but man should be considered as social. He was not born to live alone. Society is his element, out of which he sickens and dies. His whole history demonstrates that he is bound to his brother by many strong and indissolable ties. So numerous are his wants, so complicated are they in their nature, that life to an isolated individual would be rather a curse than a blessing. To live and be happy, man must be in society; he must co-operate with his brother, and the evils which mocked the individual may be successfully combatted by their united strength. Man may indeed retire to the desert, he may lodge in the cave, he may drag out a loathed existence, but it will be useless to the world and loathsome to himself.

In addition to an intellectual and social, he should be considered a religious being.—Whether he be indebted to nature or to education for this quality, it is evident from experience that he possesses it; and the philosopher that should overlook it, in his moral disquisitions or in his attempts to discover a correct system of ethicks would but half perform his work. Man, wherever beheld, no matter in what age or in what country, recognizes an Over-ruling Power, on whom he is dependant and to whom he believes himself to owe allegiance. And indeed, such is his situation, such the constitution of his nature and such the character of his wants, of his hopes and fears, that a large share of his happiness has been found to flow from a consciousness of this dependence and the acknowledgement of this allegiance. Sensible of the mutability of every sublunary object, convinced that it is in vain to trust the "arm of flesh," that his brother is one thing to-day and another to-morrow, he asks for some more powerful arm on which he can lean and find support, for some Being who is the same "yesterday, to-day and forever," into whose bosom he can pour the various emotions by which he is agitated, and to whose wisdom and goodness he can commit the disposal of all that concerns his felicity.

And to these characteristicks, let it be added that man is also a progressive being. The brute creation may have knowledge; the beaver may elicit skill and foresight in the erection of its house and the provision of its food; but the beaver of to-day is probably no wiser nor more provident than the beaver of four thousand years ago. Not so with man. One generation improves upon another. The infant not only arrives to the wisdom of manhood, but man himself can add to his own acquisitions the stock accumulated by his predecessor, and transmit it to posterity to be still enlarged by those who succeed him.

In this process a man's knowledge does not die with him, and the intellectual stores amassed by one generation may survive its ruin and form a capital for the commencement of the one to follow. Thus the human race may go on increasing from one generation to another, for aught we know, till time shall be no more. This, while it encourages our exertions, may check our vanity and forbid us to suppose we have attained perfection, or that it is improper for others to innovate upon what we have embraced or attempted to establish.

On man, in reference to each of these characteristicks, shall we keep our eye, while reviewing the various notions of Christianity which have prevailed; and that each of these may show itself in harmony with the others will constitute our guide in discovering a system worthy our adoption. EDITOR.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

TO OUR READERS.

We present our readers with the first number of the seventh volume of the Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, under circumstances peculiarly flattering to our feelings. For six years this paper has laboured to defend liberal sentiments—to disseminate correct views of God and of men—to warm the social affections and to expand the heart with gratitude to our Heavenly Father, and with benevolence to the human race. Through the good Providence of Him who rules over all, its labours, we trust, have not been in vain.

When commenced, its support was feeble; its patronage was confined, and its editor had little but hope to cheer his heart and animate his labours. It had to surmount the timidity of its friends, and to bear up against the overwhelming force of ancient prejudices and servile adherence to whimsical follies and pernicious errours; but it has succeeded, and its bitterest opposers are compelled, involuntarily indeed, to treat it with respect, and to acknowledge that its influence is great and its character fearless and independent.—Its success has surpassed the most sanguine expectations of its friends; and its present prospects are encouraging and extremely pleasing to all who are friendly to the doctrine it advocates and the course it has pursued.

We flatter ourselves, that the paper is now so firmly established, and so liberally patronized, that it will continue to maintain its character and command the attention of the liberal minded of all parties; particularly of those, who are opposed to priest-craft, and are anxious to emancipate the mind from its former slavery. A liberal patronage allows us to devote our time to its improvement; and if study and persever-

ance, aided by an ardent desire to benefit mankind, can avail any thing, its columns shall never be barren of usefulness to the inquirer after truth.

Our highly esteemed Brother, L. S. Everett, who has so long conducted this paper, to the warm approbation of the friends of genuine religion, has removed to Charlestown, Mass. in consequence of which, the immediate supervision of the editorial department, will devolve on the writer of this article; but we are permitted to assure our readers, that this removal will not abate the zeal of the former editor for its prosperity, nor prevent him from keeping a watchful eye on the course we pursue. He has assured us that he shall, as heretofore, feel an interest in this publication, and that he will devote his leisure moments to enriching its columns with his communications. Our readers will appreciate this, and recollect that his removal does not deprive them of his labours, or of his desire to contribute to their happiness.

Of ourself we have little to say. We have contributed something to the columns of the Advocate the past year. The Editor, by those articles, is introduced to the acquaintance of those who have read them; and his sentiments, and his abilities as a writer are known to most of those who patronize this work. All we say, is, that we have a sure guide in the example of the late editor and trust we shall still find in him a faithful monitor—that we shall fearlessly and freely declare our *own* views of things—shall, regardless of praise or censure, freely animadvert on whatever we discover in the moral and religious world, which we deem inconsistent with the best interests of society.—We shall not choose to rail against the clergy, nor shall we attempt to conceal their errours or countenance their unhallowed designs to unite "Church and State," and to degrade us from the rank of freemen to the menials of a dominant sect. We shall aim to vindicate rational Christianity—to encourage genuine morality, and to lend our aid to protect the civil liberty which was so dearly bought amid the turmoil of the revolution. We shall follow our *own* conviction of right and shall spare no exertions, consistent with our conscience, of which we are capable, to render our columns interesting and instructing to all who may be our readers.

SELLON'S SERMONS.

These Sermons, sometime since, were noticed in the Advocate, and a promise, that they should be reviewed, was given. Since then we have read them somewhat attentively, but have found but little to commend, as well as little to disapprove. The authour writes with considerable energy, and in some instances, with a bold and independent spirit, which does honour to himself and the cause of Christianity. He has risen above many of the vulgar prejudices of the age, and though his mental vision is somewhat obscured by habit or early education, he still seems to see farther and with a more distinct perception than most of his contemporaries.

The authour attempts to prove the everlasting punishment of the wicked, though he condemns, with energy and reason, the supposition that any of the human family will be subject to eternal torture. The everlasting punishment of the wicked, according to his views of it, is "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord;" or, in other words, total annihilation of being. This, tho' bad enough, is much better than endless misery. We should, for ourself, much rather be annihilated than compelled to burn eternally in that lake of fire and brimstone, on which the imagination of our orthodox friends is so prone to dwell; but of annihilation we would say with Young, "It is an after thought, a monstrous wish! unborn till virtue dies!"

The Sermons are nine in number, and the first, the one we now notice, developes not only the design of the authour but the peculiar ground on which he predicates the everlasting punishment of the wicked.—His design is to reconcile the everlasting punishment of the wicked with the unbounded benevolence of God—a thing much easier attempted than done. Temporal pain, which shall result in the good or felicity of him that suffers it, may be consistent with infinite benevolence, but we very much doubt whether it is in the power of Omnipotence itself, to be benevolent to the being it punishes with everlasting destruction.—Only one argument in this Sermon is to be found that attempts to prove the wicked will be punished with everlasting destruction in the world to come. The text, which is Matt. xxv. 46, is applied to a future world, and the preacher tells his brethren that he had "in a former discourse," proved it, but as we did not hear that "former discourse," we are unable to decide, whether he succeeded in proving that Christ was mistaken, when he said it should be in the generation in which he spoke, (see Matt. xxiv. 34,) or that the events of which he was then speaking, should transpire before that generation should "pass away." It is in another world, however, according to the sermon before us, where these events are to take place, because Christ said "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels in heaven, neither the Son but the Father only." It is therefore inferred that Christ "could not have foretold its approach in any given period, therefore it must be in another world." But Christ might have known the general period, without knowing the particular day and hour; and from the frequency with which he warned his disciples to "watch," we should naturally infer, as well as from his declarations, that his coming, the day of judgement and the punishment of the wicked, was to take place during the life-time of some that heard him speak.—See Matt. xvi. 27, 28.

One reason only is assigned here to show that this punishment will be endless. The duration of the punishment of the wicked and of the life of the righteous is expressed by the same term, and as the life of the righteous is allowed to be endless, the punishment of the wicked must also be endless. This is not a weighty argument, and certainly not conclusive. In the passage under consideration, there is room for doubt, whether the "eternal life," spoken of, mean any thing more than that life which the Christian enjoys in

this world, by believing on the Son of God. And if it does, the word rendered "everlasting," is ambiguous and its meaning must be ascertained from the nature of the subject to which it is applied. When applied to subjects which are not, from their nature, necessarily limited, it *may* mean endless duration, but in all other cases, it *must* have a different signification. It is incumbent then on the authour to show that there is nothing in the nature of punishment which forbids its being endless, before he relies implicitly on the conclusion he has drawn. So much for his argument to prove the punishment endless.

To reconcile this punishment with the goodness of God, he considers the "effects of the Christian dispensation upon all who lived and died *under the law*; and secondly, upon those who live and die under the *covenant of grace*.

The condition of mankind, before the coming of Christ, is stated by the authour, to subject all, without exception, who lived before that event, *to death*. He considers the penalty attached to the law to be *death* in its strict and literal sense. Consequently, if there had been no Saviour provided, all who died, or rather all who lived, would have died and ceased to have any existence any where. Had it not been for Christ, there could have been no resurrection from the dead. The effect of the Gospel dispensation upon those that thus lived and died, is a complete resurrection to life and justification in the sight of God. According to Paul, "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." That is, according to our preacher's interpretation, if the question be asked, who shall be made alive? "all who died in Adam—all who died *under the law*," is the answer. By what authority he considers the expression, "all who die in Adam," as synonymous with "all who died under the law," he has not seen proper to inform us, and as we are ignorant of any such authority, we let it pass.

The authour of the sermon is certainly very liberal to all who lived under the law; for, if we understand his reasoning, he saves every human being who lived and died before the coming of Christ. The effect of Christ's mission on them was final salvation in the kingdom of God. This is very good; no one can ask any thing better with regard to them.

But "we," we are told, "are not under the law, but under the dispensation of grace. The law has been fulfilled and repealed; (the law which made death the penalty of sin;) and therefore we have nothing to do with that, *as a law;* but we are now under the covenant of grace." This is well enough, but what is our condition? "No commandment has been given to us, with any penalty attached to its infringement." This answer is correct. Another question presses for an answer, what will be our final destination? "God will give us endless life if we will believe his assurance," or, according to his views, we who live under the Gospel, are not under the penalty which was attached to the law, that we all have endless life offered to us on the simple condition of our believing the assurances Deity has made us; but if we will not believe, God will leave us to ourselves.—We shall indeed be raised from the dead and judged, but we shall still be left to ourselves, and we shall die, we shall be no more, consequently "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power."

This, the preacher thinks will be the best that God can do for us, and this he thinks is a much better condition than those under the law had. Perhaps it is so; but we think it would have been better to have used the discretion of Constantine the Great. At the time that prince reigned, it was a sentiment in the Church, that all the sins a man committed before baptism, should be forgiven on its reception. The Emperor, who had not preserved his life wholly free from crime, and perhaps a little distrustful what might be his conduct after his baptism, very wisely deferred being baptized until a few hours before his death.—Could the Almighty have so managed his affairs as to have delayed the advent of his Son until the last generation was upon earth, we think it would have been the means of carrying many more to heaven. According to the hypothesis under consideration, all who died before the coming of Christ, will go to heaven, but many who have lived under the covenant of grace will go into everlasting punishment. All mankind would indeed have slept an eternal sleep, had not Christ appeared to awake them. His coming, as it is, is good, but if it had been delayed until the end of the generations of men, it would have been much better.

(To be continued.)

CIRCULAR TO POST-MASTERS.

The following was handed to us by the Post-Master to whom it was addressed, and we insert it for the benefit of all parties who may feel themselves interested.

"☞If the Post-master cannot attend to the subject of this letter, he is requested to hand it over immediately to some influential friend favourable to the object, with a request that he will attend to it without delay.

"*New-York, December* 10, 1828.

"SIR:—Memorials to Congress are preparing, from various parts of the United States, praying that the transportation and opening of Mails, and the delivery of Letters, &c. on the Sabbath, may no longer be required. The Post-Office in London is never opened on Sundays, and there seems to be no necessity that the Post-Offices in this country should be opened on that day, especially in a time of peace.

"We suppose that you will concur in an effort which will afford an opportunity for the enjoyment of this day of rest, on the part of yourself, your brethren the Deputy Post-Masters throughout the U. States, and their Clerks. As no body of men in the country are required to work for others on Sundays, as they are—and while all other offices under Government are closed on that day, it seems unreasonable to require that Post-Masters and their Clerks should be deprived of a privilege guaranteed to every human being by the laws of God.

"You are respectfully requested to prepare a Memorial to Congress on the subject, and take immediate measures to procure the signatures of those in your neighbourhood who are friendly to the object, and to forward it to a Member of Congress immediately.—We hope, also, that the most influential men in your

vicinity will write to those Members of the Government and of Congress they are acquainted with, urging upon them the importance of the measures proposed. We remain, respectfully, your fellow-citizens.

JOHN WESTFIELD,
THOMAS STOKES, } *Committee.*
KNOWLES TAYLOR,

We have neither time nor room to make many remarks on the above. We are at no loss to ascertain the source whence it came. It bears the mark of the beast, and is easily discovered to be the offspring of that pernicious spirit, which seems to have possessed the leaders of the Orthodox party in our country.

We are disgusted with the constant interference of the leading religious sects of our country, in that which does not concern them. *Religious* people should mind their own business. If they believe mankind will be eternally damned, if they do not spend every seventh day in idleness or attend their conventicles, let them say so; but let them beware how they interfere with our civil rights, or attempt to coerce us into their own measures. Let them beware how they obtrude their bigotry or their exclusive orthodoxy into the hall of Congress.

We feel as anxious, as any man can, to promote morality, but with all our anxiety we have not yet obtained the impudence to think of asking Congress to pass laws agreeable to some religious whim, which we may have imbibed from the fraud or ignorance of our fathers. We dislike the spirit that breathes in this Circular. It indicates, on the part of its framers, a desire to rule, and a determination to carry their own points at all hazards. They cannot be concerned that the publick morals may suffer, by having the mail carried on Sunday or having it opened. This is not the thing. They are anxious to get the minds of our citizens engrossed in contentions about meats and drinks, and in the observance of days, and when they can accomplish this, they have prepared the people of the United States for a union of Church and State, or rather for a usurpation of the Church over the State.

And how will our national government like the proposal of the practice of London as a precedent for their imitation? We have declared our *independence;* and we are inclined to think it may be possible for us to be the best judges of our own interest. In England they have an established religion, why not in this instance imitate our mother? To us there appears no iniquity in running the mail, or in opening it on the first day of the week, more than there does on any other day of the week. And we believe the commercial interest of our country would materially suffer by the proposed delay. To have the mail stop, and the post-offices also to be closed, one day in seven, would enable speculators to outrun the mail, and, possessed of important information, they might practice many deleterious impositions upon many an honest man before the intelligence the mail might bring could put him upon his guard. The measure might assist knaves to the injury of honest men, which indeed may be the desire of the Orthodox.

We have two long communications from Mr. Rains on the subject of Baptism or the "ancient order of things." Their great length prevents our presenting them immediately to our readers. There is no harm in this. The subjects may be discussed at any time, and a little delay will not we think be the means of sending any soul to an endless hell. However, we promise to publish the communications as soon as we can find room. And for the benefit of their authour, we also inform him Br. Everett has promised to have replies to them forthcoming.

ORTHODOX AMBITION.

Our orthodox friends seem determined to have the supreme direction of our fortunes, our lives and our consciences. They are making extraordinary exertions—exertions alarming to every one who can appreciate the blessings we enjoy, from the rational liberty which our fathers purchased for us, with their toils, fatigues and blood. But we have among us a class of beings, who anathematize all liberty but the liberty for themselves to rule; and who trample upon all right, but the right for themselves to impose their whim, their avarice or their ambition as the law by which all but themselves should be governed. This class of beings are called men—called clergymen, and even profess to be the ministers of Jesus. They may be called aright; but they are destitute of every principle in their conduct which makes man beneficial to his fellow man—which makes the clergyman useful to religion, or which can make the minister advantageous to the cause of his Master.

Let the people watch this class—there is need. We have for some time had our eye on their proceedings. We have felt disgusted with their arrogance. We are alarmed for our civil and religious rights. We shall keep our eye upon them and as a faithful watchman on the walls of Zion we shall tell what we discover bearing the form of danger.

We are informed by a friend of the death of Mrs. REESE, wife of Rev. W. I. REESE, of West-Bloomfield, Ontario county. We regret to state this loss to our highly esteemed brother in the ministry. But we trust, though he weeps her loss, it is not without hope that he shall meet her again, where death cannot sever the strong cords of affection or break the tender ligaments which twine around the hearts of those who are happy in mutual love.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATION.

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

CHRISTIANITY.---NO. 3.

I have no wish to represent life more gloomy than it is. I can forgive the fairy hopes of youth; and I even regret that experience has dissolved that ideal world, where my imagination, unchecked, used to erect for its luxury a thousand magnificent palaces, filled with every thing gratifying to the senses. Dream on,

lovely youth, I would not too soon wake your blissful slumbers to the painful scenes of reality. My dreams are fled; my visions of uninterrupted enjoyment are dissolved, but I envy not others all they snatch of felicity from the imagination which heightens the pleasures, while it conceals the ills of life. I have seen much of this wearisome world. I have lived till all those who shortened its journey are gone, and I am left alone in the midst of a new generation, who have but little in common with myself. But I love them as I did their fathers, and I rejoice that the smiles of Heaven rest upon them. I would not becloud their brows or damp the ardour of their hopes by speaking of the ills, the disappointments, the plagues which man is heir to. Could I enlarge the portion of human bliss, extract the bitter from the cup of life, and raise the heart in gratitude to God, cold as age has made my heart, I should still feel it burn with the most pleasing emotions.

I have said the life of man was made up of little things, which, when viewed at a distance, seemed scarcely worth noticing; but these little things are great to little man. What are usually termed great events seldom occur, and when they do, but few are effected by them. The great mass of mankind continue, unmolested, their accustomed pursuits, contract the same number of friendships or antipathies; feel about the same degree of joy, or languish with the same number of sorrows; are troubled with the same number of vexations or petty disappointments.

The machinery of state may move on undisturbed, the nation may flourish, may enlarge its power, extend its commerce or its conquests, notwithstanding private griefs or family afflictions. Little consolation can the wisdom of statesmen, the prosperity of a nation, its affluence or its power, bring to the house now left destitute of its chief support,—small the relief they can afford the father, the mother weeping the loss of an only child, who engrossed their affections, who promised to smooth the asperities of the road of life, lessen the fatigue of its journey, and to support their tottering steps near its conclusion.

The loss of a fleet, the defeat of an army, the disgrace of a statesman, the death of a sovereign, though matters of great national concern, do not wound the heart with that bitter anguish, nor inflict that poignancy of grief, as does the death of a child or a companion, the loss of a father or a mother, of a brother or a sister. The departure of these open the channels of sorrow, and awaken a thousand tender associations, rendered doubly affecting because the connecting link is broken. The scenes of childhood and youth; their joys and transient sorrows, their transports and vexations, their little competitions and defeats, all rush upon the mind and overwhelm it with melancholy sensations. Here is discovered the peculiar worth of religion.

I care not how cold and unfeeling some may be to these things and others of a similar nature, I have always prayed for a heart which should be alive to all the tender sensibilities of our nature. Those who have never rejoiced with other's joy, who have never wept at other's woes, may, wrapt up in the mantle of their own insensibility, say, these "are small affairs." Those who have never exercised the sympathetick powers of the human breast, nor been involved in its griefs, may command us to treat them with indifference, and to avoid their power by forbidding them to disturb our repose or to be-cloud the serenity of our minds. I have listened to such lessons; with them still sounding in my ear, I have entered the house of mourning. I have seen the mother, pale, emaciated, and her eyes swollen with grief, watching the lifeless clay of her only child which was wrapt up in maternal affection. I forgot my lesson, and the tear was standing in my eye before I could recollect what the masters had taught. I have seen the wife, with her little ones, stand beside the grave of her husband and the father of her children; I have marked the throbbing of her pulse and the heaving of her bosom as the clods of the valley were thrown over what was once so dear to her heart—I would have wished the lightnings of heaven to have blasted me had I been unmoved.

I have joined the bridal party when love perched upon every countenance, and joy filled each heart. I have seen the blushing, trembling and half-reluctant bride led to the altar. I have run over in my mind the hopes, the pure sensation that thrill the soul of the favoured youth, when from the man of God he receives heaven's last best gift—a wife. I would have despised myself to have remained indifferent, incapable of participating the festivities and the social bliss which should ever grace one of the brightest spots in human life, and one of the few times we can say we are happy.

The lessons of stoicks, the practice of asceticks, and the desperation of misanthropicks, may sound very well to preach to blocks and stones, but are unavailing to human nature. They offer very good lessons, but unfortunately for their reputation, they are wholly impracticable, and if not, to obtain the state of mind they require, uniformly costs us an effort not less painful than the evils they are designed to avert. They relieve us from pain by making us insensible.

How different is the religion of Christ! It addresses itself to mankind in the situation in which the occurrences of life have placed them; and it can bring them relief without destroying their sensibility, or making any apparent alteration in their circumstances. It does not

dry the tears of the mourner, but it converts them into streams of consolation. It does not forbid the parent to mourn the loss of a beloved child; it does not chide the unaffected grief of the sister for the death of her brother, but mingles its tears with theirs, and adds a luxury to their sorrows which the philosophy of the world can never feel nor ever appreciate.

Those who overlook these considerations and value religion only as it affects the noisy affairs of human society, greatly underrate her worth, mistake her province, and forget the most extensive sphere of her usefulness. It is not to the gilded trappings of a court; it is not to the fury and carnage of war; it is not to the palaces of royalty, nor to those of the powerful or the oppulent, that we are to confine religion or to look for its influence. It is not from the dazzling splendour of the sun that we are to estimate its worth, but from that light which it emits, and though unseen enables us to see every object on which it shines, and from that invigourating quality it sends forth, which silently gives life and energy to every department of the natural world. It is in the retired walks of life we can discover the secret power of religion; and it is there we are to look for the little fountain which sends out its perpetual streams to supply the thirsty in every section and in every condition from the peasant to the monarch.

I have seated myself in the domestick circle. It was religion that endeared the hearts of each to the other; it was religion which warmed the counsels that flowed from paternal affection to form the opening mind; it was the efficacious power of religion which expanded the beauty of intellect, developed its latent virtues, and implanted that love to God and that benevolence to man, which made the riper years of the youth useful to the world and honorable to himself. O how I have felt to thank God for the gift of religion, when I have marked it refining the sensibility, preparing the heart for enjoyment, and arming it with fortitude in the midst of the numerous evils it must endure! I have seen the angel presence of religion by the bed of the sick and the dying, lending patience to the afflicted, courage to those who were about to try the realities of an unknown world, and resignation to those who were bereaved of those they loved. And I have felt its power too, when my life was beset on every side with dangers, when my heart sickened with the vice and folly of the world, turned with disgust from all sublunary objects, when friendless, far from the companions of my youth or my riper associates, I drew near to the "narrow house" and expected every moment when it should become my dwelling, yes then I *felt* religion had power to pull aside the veil which hides futurity from the sight of mortals, and to permit the mind, as if freed from its earthly clog, to roam at pleasure among the undefined and unnamed pleasures of the paradisical world. A BELIEVER.

[*To be continued.*]

SELECTIONS.

From the Washington (Ohio) Republican.

ATTENTION THE UNIVERSE!

Iste Deus qui sit, piccatur excubo.

An impostor was brought into this town on the 13th inst. who declared himself to be Jesus Christ; and that he had recently come from Heaven for the purpose of judging the world, which was shortly to be at an end. He attempted proving his divinity, by showing the prints of his nails on the different members of his body; his judgement here was rather nonsuited; for the citizens invariably believed him to be, not only an impostor, but a felon, whose actions at some period, had merited an acquaintance with *handcuffs* and *fetters*.

This strange prodigy is remarkably expert in quoting scripture, and is not without followers as might be expected; he has erected his throne for the purpose of judging the world, on Leatherwood, about seven miles from this place where he has been for about five weeks. On the 12 inst. he ascended his throne, with all the pomp and presumption imaginable, and commenced the execution of his mission. On the same evening, after having suspended his judgements, he repaired to the house of one of his followers, (who accompanied him to this place,) where all his proselytes, about twenty, were collected for the alone purpose of worshipping him; at his presence, they immediately prostrated themselves at his feet calling him the true God. Amongst these enthusiastick devotees, are found some who were formerly considered the most respectable citizens in that neighbourhood; even some who have preached the gospel in at least two different bodies, and have now descended to worship this strange god, who declares that he can shake heaven and earth with his nod, that he can engulf the human family in the vortex of oblivion, if he should say it, and that the whole host of heaven are prompt in the execution of his word.

The impostor was taken before a magistrate of this place, who could find no accusation *(mirabile dictu!)* against him; no law applicable to a god, and consequently, Jupiter was dismissed.

A citizen of Leatherwood, knowing the injury he had done to his followers; some of whom were entirely deranged; others, careless of property, had turned their flocks into their cornfields, could not permit him to go with impunity, but immediately smote the divinity and gave him an opportunity of escaping. He embraced it, and left town with seventy-five or a hundred of our citizens after him.

Mrs. Royall is travelling through the interiour of Pennsylvania, circulating her *Black Book*, and annoying the Missionaries. She speaks of finding "a nest of them and their supporters" at Carlisle, where, she observes, "the Presbyterian clergy rule with absolute sway." She gives a sad description of one priest Duffield in that place, and does not mention in very honourable terms, the Faculty of the College; "not one of whom," she says, "had the courage to look me in the face, excepting Professor Spencer. They flew like traitors, locked themselves up, and all attempts to see them were fruitless. Instead of meeting me like men and furnishing that information which is always furnished me by the Faculty of other colleges in my travels, they hid from me like cowards. If they were doing good what had they to fear?"

She speaks very highly of the German population of Pennsylvania, of their well cultivated farms, &c. and says "these farmers are not so priest-ridden as the people of Philadelphia, or the English people so called. I admire their independence and superiour judgement in guarding their purse and their families from those hypocritical swindlers who prowl over the country to obtain money, under pretence of promoting the cause of Christianity."

Reformer.

From the Trumpet and Magazine.

In compliance with an invitation from the First Universalist Society in Charlestown, Mass. the Rev. L. S. Everett, of Auburn, N. Y. visited and preached to them as a Candidate for their desk—After a very pleasant and interesting season of probation, the Society unanimously invited him to labour with them in the important office of a Gospel Minister. Mr. Everett has accepted the invitation, and present appearances indicate that the expected connexion will be a happy and profitable one, and it is fondly hoped that the anticipations, grounded on the pleasant experience which the Society has already enjoyed with Mr. Everett, will be fully realized, and that the trials it has had to pass, and the difficulties it has had to encounter will prove only preparatory to a state of permanent enjoyment upon which it is about to enter.—Mr. Everett may be expected to enter on the duties of his office about the middle of this month.

Charlestown, January, 1829.

Judicious.—The editor of a new paper in Vermont, makes this significant remark in his prospectus: "Those who never intend to pay are requested never to subscribe." The suggestion is very fair, and is capable of only one improvement: to extend its application to *old* as well as to *new* papers. However complimentary the non-paying part of community may think it to bestow their *patronage* upon newspapers, such support is a little too unsubstantial to render it either convenient or desirable to publishers. All persons, therefore, whom this subject may concern, are desired to take heed.

To Correspondents.—Several communications from correspondents, which were received by the former editor, are in our possession; but we have not had time to examine them. Those who have hitherto contributed to the columns of the Gospel Advocate are requested to continue their favours, and preachers generally, of our own or any other order, are solicited to lend us their aid in our attempt to enlighten the mind and augment the sum of human happiness.

Notice.—The Editor will preach at Syracuse on Tuesday evening the 13th, at Salina on Wednesday the 14th, and at Jamesville on Thursday the 15th inst. He will also preach in the village of Oswego on the 20th.

☞Many of our subscribers have requested to be notified of the terms of binding the Advocate. The usual price is sixty-two and a half cents a volume, full bound and lettered, or fifty cents half bound and lettered. If delivered at the store of the publisher in the course of this or the ensuing month, so that they can be bound in quantity, a reduction will be made from the above prices of twelve and a half cents a volume. Publisher.

ADDITIONAL AGENTS.

In addition to the number of Agents published in the last volume, we insert the names of the following gentlemen, with a request that in all places where the Advocate is circulated and where there is no agent, our friends would recommend to us some suitable person who will be active in procuring subscriptions and in making remittances, and we will publish his name as duly authorized.

J. D. Shuart, East Oswego, Oswego county, N. Y.—*A. J. Whitmore*, Salina, Onondaga co. N. Y.—*S. B. Bradly*, Benton Centre, Yates co. N.Y.—*Thaddeus Elliot*, Centreville, Allegany co. N. Y.—*Rev. N. Stacy*, Hamilton, Madison co. N. Y.—*D. Pike*, Clymer, Chatauque co. N. Y.—*S. J. McMories*, *Esq.* Columbia, S. C.—*Wm. Hatfield*, Freedom, Chattaraugus co. N. Y.—*Wm. Miner*, *Esq. P. M.* Genoa, Cayuga co. N. Y.—*Justice Kent*, Hopbottom, Susquehannah co. Pa.—*Squire Goff*, Mendon, Monroe co. N. Y.—*Joshua Slayton*, Royalton, Niagara co. N. Y.—*Reuben C. Pixley*, *Esq. P. M.* York, Sandusky co. Ohio.—*Benjamin Reynolds*, Dryden, Tompkins co. N. Y.

Poetick Department.

[From the Athenæum.]

THE BUTTERFLY.

I'd be a butterfly, born in a bower
Where roses and lillies and violets meet;
Roving for ever from flower to flower,
And kissing all buds that are pretty and sweet.

I'd never languish for wealth or for pow'r:
I'd never sigh to see slaves at my feet—
I'd be a butterfly, born in a bower,
Kissing all buds that are pretty and sweet.

O could I pilfer the wand of a fairy,
I'd have a pair of those beautiful wings:
Their summer day's rattle is sportive and airy,
They sleep in a rose when the nightingale sings.

Those who have wealth must be watchful and wary;
Power, alas! nought but misery brings;
I'd be a butterfly, sportive and airy,
Rock'd in a rose when the nightingale sings.

What though you tell me each gay little rover
Shrinks from the breath of the first autumn day!
Sure it is better when summer is over,
To die when all fair things are fading away.

Some in life's winter may toil to discover
Means of procuring a weary delay—
I'd be a butterfly, living a rover—
Dying when fair things are fading away.

BAYLEY.

From the Liberalist.

CREEDS.

The Indian bows before the sacred stone—
The Gheber worships at his holy flame—
The Tartar dares a Lord—a god to own,
Like to himself in being and in name—
The Mussulman 'mid flames, and groans and blood,
Rears high the crescent o'er the battle field,
And gives the tribute of the vital flood,
Ere his false prophet's creed of carnage yield;
The outcast Hebrew still adores the God
Of wonted worship, ere their pride was gone;
But needs no sculptured stone, no imaged wood
To fix his mind on the Almighty ONE—
The Christian like the Heathen, not content
That all the power in ONE should centred be,
Yet not so strongly on the measure bent,
Compounds the matter by adoring THREE.
Yet each adores that great Eternal Name
That guides the tempest as it rushes by,
That though the Earth created men the same,
Alike the heirs of one high destiny.
Yes, each, adores him, save in name and mode,
Yet for that name and mode they fain would make
Of what th' Eternal loves, a scene of blood,
And fondly deem it for th' eternal's sake,
And calling their own will, the will of Heaven,
Would crush the foes that do deny it dare;
And rather than those foes should be forgiven,
Would scarce deem Heaven were Heaven, if THEY were there.

WOMAN'S LOVE.

And this is woman's story—her heart's history—
The tale of one who loved as only woman loves—
In sickness, and in sorrow, and in death.

He came, a meteor from the sky
As of celestial light,
And burst on sorrow's languid eye,
Like visions of the night;
And, bending o'er the bed of death,
Stole from the hand the cypress wreath,
And placed upon the aching brows
What seemed a bright, immortal rose.

Why should I tell that rose's name?
Nourished with secret tears it grew,
As o'er the faint and feeble frame
The fragrance of the heart it threw;
Then even sickness wore a charm,
And o'er its lilly-pallid form,
Love's rainbow-tints and sunbeams stole
Like emanations from the soul.

And years rolled on—and still that flower
Its chaste, its hidden fragrance shed;
It never knew a closing hour—
It never bowed its beauteous head;
But lovelier looked amidst the blast,
And wintry storms that o'er it passed,
And all those deadlier blights that come,
To flowers that make the heart their home.

The *heart* their *home*?—ah idle thought!
Did the heart ever find a home?
Save that like airy castles wrought
By fancy in her cheating loom.
The bright, bright rose, where is it now?
Still does it hide an aching brow?
Or chambered in the bosom's cell,
There only its sad story tell.

Its story?—mark each scattered leaf!
Its story?—see that funeral urn!—
This was Love's rose, and this the brief,
The short liv'd flow'r to which we turn!
And this is woman's tale of sorrow—
Alas! her yesterday—to-morrow—
Her past—her present—her to come—
Her heart's brief story—and its doom!

FAREWELL TO A FRIEND.

To souls less formed than thine to feel,
Less idle were the tale,
How feebly words the heart reveal!
Expression's power how frail!
But thee the voiceless pangs that rend
Thine own warm bosom tell
How vain, how poor, the aid these lend
To speak the heart's farewell.

The clouds that on the future rest,
And ardent hope restrain;
The thoughts that mem'ry *will* suggest,
And parting turns to pain;
The fear that doubts all other love,
Save that we've proved so well:
Oh! these expression's power above,
Embitter a farewell!

A long farewell!—The feeling mind
Will own a tinge of sorrow,
Though sure the friend it has resigned
'Twill meet in smiles to-morrow.
Then what the pang when years must roll,
And life's stream cease to swell,
Nor bring the dear one of our soul,
To whom we bid farewell!

Farewell!—whatever may remain
Of fitful change for me,
Be not the oft breathed prayer in vain,
For weal to thine and thee.
Too late we met, too soon we part,
And friendship's dreams dispel;
Doom'd just to know each other's heart,
And say—a long farewell!

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *at* $1 50, *per annum, payable in advance.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1829. [NO. 2.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON

WHY MEN FOLLOW VICE.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

"The ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace."—Prov. iii. 17,

1. Most people, I believe, are willing to acknowledge "the way of the transgressor is hard;" and very few but are equally willing to admit, "the ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness and that all her paths are peace." The pain and anxiety which most feel in by far the greater part of their pursuits, one would think, were sufficient to fasten the conviction that they are wandering in errour; and also to excite an inquiry if they cannot adopt some expedient more favourable to happiness. I say, one would think, the pain and anxiety sufficient, and I believe it actually is. No man can be unhappy without perceiving it; and few who regard what passes in their own minds can be at a loss to determine its true cause.

2. It is thus we often hear persons apparently the most guilty the loudest in their complaints against vice. You never hear persons of intemperate habits, in their moments of sobriety, commending intemperance or approving their own course. Speak to an intemperate man of the deleterious consequences of intemperance. Tell him with the deepest pathos that its tendency is ruin and he will perhaps surprise you with his acute perception of its destructive nature, and the masterly manner with which he developes its hidden enormities. No man can lecture more profoundly or more successfully on the beauty and utily of temperance; and no man can feel more accutely that he has "put an enemy in his mouth to steal away his brain." But instead of this conviction, this accute sensibility leading him to reform, it often only drains another bowl to drown itself.

3. Hence perhaps we are able to discover the fallacy of a very current philosophy among many who make great pretensions to correct thinking; whose principle dogma is, convince a man what you propose is really good, make his mind perceive that it is truly desirable, and you enlist all his powers to accomplish it. This is not always nor even very often the fact. There can be no doubt the intemperate is more clearly convinced of the importance of temperance than the perfectly temperate man is. This is evinced by those frequent resolutions which he makes to reform; but which seldom succeed. And this discloses another mistake in supposing the will to be the governing principle of human actions.

4. It can hardly be supposed that a man's will is averse to happiness, when indeed, we see a desire for happiness is the first and strongest principle developed in our nature. Nor can we admit that men are entirely ignorant of the true source of that which they so ardently desire. Ignorant, no doubt they are, in many respects; but I shall not be told a man endowed with the ordinary share of understanding, is so ignorant as to believe that sin or vice is more conducive to his happiness than virtue. Nor shall I find much dispute respecting what is virtue or what is vice. How happens it then with this desire, with this conviction and this knowledge, that man still continues to pursue the road which leads to his own destruction? That I am right, in my supposition respecting the will, may be easily ascertained from the seventh chapter of Paul to the Romans, who speaks as every enlightened man who regards the operations of his own mind must speak.—See verse 15: "For that which I do I allow not, for what I would that do I not, but what I hate that I do." Let then the question recur, how happens it, that men with the knowledge of the road which leads to happiness, with a strong desire to walk in it, do, notwithstanding this knowledge and this desire, continue in a course which they are sensible yields them no enjoyment?

5. I know it has been thought the cause lies in the will. But *will* can hardly be said to exist in opposition to the clear conviction of the understanding and the strong desire of the heart. Call will what you please, you can make it nothing more nor less than the determination of the mind. How the mind can determine against that which it perceives to be for its own good, and against that which it has a strong desire to possess, is to me a problem not easy to solve. Let it be understood, we think it sufficiently evident, if not from the remarks we have made, from every one's experience, that a man may, nay often does, continue a practice which the clearest convictions of his own understanding disapprove; that he

may reject that which he believes is for his best interest, and that too, when he desires, yea, when he is exerting all his powers, to possess it. For we still believe every rational man believes religion to be for his highest interest. We also believe that every sober-minded man knows whether he possesses it or not; that he knows also that vice is the cause of the uneasiness he feels, and that he is fully convinced that religion would relieve him of his uneasiness. How then can his will determine against it?

6. Now I believe it does not thus determine. I contend that *will*, instead of being against or being averse to walking the paths of wisdom, is in favour of it; that will, instead of being opposed to God, as too many theologians dream, is often the only friend left him in the human heart. The Christian world have here fallen into a gross mistake. In their zeal against sin, in their declamations against human depravity, they have divested the heart of every principle which is commendable and have described the powers of the mind, as well as of the body, without a single exception, as enlisted in the service of Satan, as determined to dethrone Jehovah; and as resolved to trample every thing bearing a mark of holiness, in the dust. But this is all mere declamation. The language of Paul, in the chapter to the Romans, to which we have already referred, should make them blush for this ignorance and want of attention to the oracles of Truth. Paul, assuming the character of the unbeliever, says the "good *I* would," that is, the good which *I*, the intellectual man, my reason or judgement or will, "would do, I do not, but the evil I, the inner or intellectual man, would not, that I do." "I find then," continues the apostle, "a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me; for I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."—Some I know suppose Paul was here speaking of a man after regeneration, but of this there is no proof, and his adding immediately, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" seems to imply that it was a person unacquainted with the salvation wrought in the soul of the believer by Christ. If the Christian is subject to death, or if a man who is "born again," is crying for deliverance in this manner, I would not give much for his Christianity nor for his new birth. But that Paul was speaking of the unbeliever, is made still more clear from the following verse, "I thank God that I am delivered through Jesus Christ our Lord. Do I myself then as a slave, serve with the mind, the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin? By no means." (See Kneeland's translation which makes the sense clear and plain.)

7. The difficulty is now before us. The ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness;—mankind see them—desire to walk in them. What is the reason they do not? I believe this question, difficult as it may seem, can be answered. If we mark clearly, we shall discover quite an army of appetites and passions which overwhelm the reason, judgement or will and carry it away captive. These appetites and passions fasten upon their objects and demand immediate gratification. They are so noisy and impetuous in their demands, that the voice of reason is overpowered and put to silence. The person is like a feeble bark destitute of chart or rudder, abandoned to the mercy of the raging ocean, and every moment in danger of being engulphed or dashed against the rocks. But it may be asked, what are these appetites or passions, whence do they derive their power? and if they are able to take reason and judgement captive, how can we avoid the slavery of vice to which they subject us?

8. To enumerate these appetites and passions, is not the business of the preacher, but of the metaphysician; and we shall not now encroach upon his prerogative. Every man may easily understand what I mean by them. When a man has an appetite for ardent spirits, he is apt to indulge it when reason bids him forbear. And when this appetite becomes strong and urgent he indulges it even when he wills or determines to abstain. Every one is sensible that when he gets very angry, the passion of anger overpowers his reason, and he often does that which he bitterly regrets, when it subsides. So probably of all appetites or passions of which we are susceptible. But whence do they derive their power?

9. This question has led to many disputes, and given rise to many theories, by no means favourable to virtue. Some, fond of any excuse, blame poor nature at a most unmerciful rate, and say that all is owing to the peculiarities of our organick structure. That is, we are so made, the workman who manufactured us, mingled the various ingredients, in such irregular proportions, that our constitution is the cause of all the evils which flow from our wild and ungovernable appetites and passions. This may be true; but, though it would exonerate us from all blame, it is not a very comfortable thought: for all the irregularities, of which we complain, arising from our very natures, must be inevitable, and as we can hardly hope to change our natures, we must expect always to endure whatever evils they bring in their train. And, if we should admit it to be true, we should only, perhaps, have to call the most vicious man the most virtuous. For he that is most vicious, is so only because he has the most unfavourable constitution, and having to struggle against the heaviest load, he has tried probably the hardest to be good, and should be

rewarded according to his exertion, and not according to what he has actually accomplished. A man has done well—that is nothing. He had no difficulties to encounter; his constitutional bias was in his favour and led him naturally by its influence to the performance of his duty. The vicious man has done bad.—True; but then, poor man! he tried to do better, but his constitution was so perverse, he could not. He must be judged by the hardness with which he tried to be good. I always suspect those philosophers, who attribute their imperfections to the perverseness of nature or the unfavourableness of their constitutional organization. It is a short way of removing a difficulty and of exonerating one's self, but not very proper.

10. But some are so very grateful to their heavenly Father, as to give him the credit of giving our appetites and passions this undue strength. He, having determined to exhibit all his attributes, resolved, as the best means of doing it, that all should become sinners, that he might convince them, that he was merciful by saving a few, and make them *feel* he was powerful by damning all the rest. He, therefore, very wisely, as Piscator, an eminent divine, of the Calvinistick church well observes, "created man to this two-fold end, that he should sin necessarily that he might be damned justly." But, notwithstanding this idea has many beauties and is "full of sweet comfort" to the elect, I am inclined to think it is not very honourable to God, nor very consoling to the greater part of mankind. At least, if it excite a hope of a pleasing state of things after death, it is not calculated to do much towards reforming mankind and increasing their happiness while here. It does not become man to charge his faults and sufferings upon Deity. He ought to have the humility to charge them to his own account. But enough—I need not pursue either of these ideas. The first, if admitted, must be a source of aggravation, and the second of continual murmuring. We see the pleasant paths of wisdom; we see them adorned with flowers and every thing inviting. We earnestly desire to walk them, but these vexatious laws of our nature or the imperfections of our constitution prevent us. This is hard; and it is no better to say the decree of the Almighty keeps us back. Some we see walking them. O how should we like to walk ourselves! but alas! the decree of Heaven has *blocked* the way and we must continue in sin that we may be "damned justly." Not much consolation from such information.

11. But whence do they derive their power? This is easy enough answered. But we shall admit there is some difference in the constitution of different persons. Different temperaments, no doubt, dispose the constitution to one pursuit, and may give favour to one set of appetites and passions rather than to another. But it will be found that habit is the demon. Habit, improper habits are what give the appetites and passions the power to run away with our reason and to bring us in bondage to the law of sin and death. Such is our constitution that when we become habituated to any pursuit, or when our mind has become biassed in favour of any particular object, no after conviction, no reason of the judgement, no determination of the will, has power to correct the errour, but we are driven by a force we cannot control into the vortex of ruin, or are lost in inevitable destruction. A temperate man takes a glass, now and then; the practice becomes habitual; the glass is more frequently taken, and the man who determined to preserve his character for sobriety, insensibly and involuntarily ends in a drunkard. So of almost any vice we may name.

12. But perhaps I may be allowed to enlarge upon this. Few persons are aware of the power of habit. Most men are carried along the current of things without reflecting whither they are borne or whither they are likely to land. An improper biass, given to the mind by the levity or indiscretion of the parent or instructor, gives rise to a course of action, which, becoming habitual, determines the future character of the individual. Perhaps almost unknown to ourselves, we may nourish, with maternal fondness, some principle, thus incautiously implanted, which may one day overwhelm us with ruin and disgrace. How many have started in life with the fairest prospects to themselves and with the brightest expectations to their friends! Their hearts were open, generous and humane. They bid fair to honour themselves and be benefactors to those with whom they were connected. Society with the warmest affection received them into its bosom, reposed the fullest confidence in their prudence and integrity; while every thing seemed to rivet the conviction that they were travelling the direct road to virtue, to happiness and to honourable distinction. But alas! they stopped suddenly in the midst of their course; their sun set at noon; oblivion snatched them from our sight.

13. But have we ability to resist the power of habit? It may not be impossible, but it is extremely difficult for persons to shake off the power of habit and return to virtue when they have long been fixed in a course of vicious aberration. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil." Though we may at first grant no great indulgence to appetite and passion; though for awhile we keep the path of virtue in our sight to which we are determined to return, after we have made a few excursions for pleasure, we have the mortification to discover one compliance paves the way for another; the fault once committed, is committed again with less

reluctance; the indulgence is extended; the practice becomes confirmed; the habit fixed and appetite has acquired a power next to impossible to subdue. The downward progress is rapid. We rush on with fatal impetuosity; we leap the precipice of destruction; and when completely ruined, look up with pain to the height from which we have fallen and wish, but vainly wish, to return! And alas! generally the remainder of life must be made up of regrets the most painful and of remorse the most poignant for our past folly and temerity. It is then the grey-headed victim of improper habit, with one foot in the grave, and his frame tottering with age and debility, with his mind shrinking from the past and trembling with apprehensions for the future, exclaims, in almost the hollow voice of the tomb, "shun my example; avoid my track—it is the road of infamy; its end is death!" Can we avoid it?

14. I cannot bring myself to answer this question in the negative. Severe indeed would be our condition, if habit had the liberty to fasten her chains, inflict her torture, and we have no power to resist or to defend ourselves. I cannot believe that Deity has subjected us to a condition so servile. He has given too many proofs of his goodness to allow his creatures to adopt a conclusion so dishonourable to him or so despondent to ourselves. The power must be lodged in the hands of men; but as the individual is not wholly culpable for the formation of improper habits, it is evident they have not always in their individual character the power to shake them off. This power is no doubt in the possession of community; and if the whole body could be persuaded to exercise it, vice would be abolished and virtue established. Most moralists have committed a fatal errour on this subject. They generally make the *individual* culpable for all his vices, and have accordingly required the individual to reform. This is not correct; the vices of the individual are generally the vices of the age, in which he lives, or of the particular persons or circumstances with whom he associates or with which he is surrounded. Habits are generally derived from a variety of causes which are unperceived by the individual and become confirmed before one is aware of their destructive tendency. To avoid them is the true method—to break their chain is difficult if not impossible. Mankind have no natural desire to be vicious. Every one loves virtue and were it not for the improper bias which perhaps at a very tender age is given his mind, were it not that his injudicious education or the peculiar circumstances of his youth or of his late years have thrown him into a channel so broad and so deep, that he cannot leave it, he would always walk in the ways of wisdom. What shall be done?

15. Much can and much must be done before society will observe the pleasant ways of wisdom to walk in them. "Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it," is a maxim founded in experience as well as in revelation, and one too, which has never been known to fail, when judiciously followed. But it is one which often requires greater knowledge as well as prudence and caution on the part of parents than they are in general qualified to exercise. We must begin by raising the standard of education. We must go back, mark the course taken by our predecessors; we must study to discover their errours, and in the system we adopt, we must aim to avoid them. We must study to enlighten the great body of the community and must contrive some way or other to get the force of habit on the side of wisdom. Habit is as firm a friend as it is a bitter enemy. It is just as easy to have habit in our favour, as it is to have it against us. All that is requisite, is, that we start right. Mankind, in the infancy of the world, were themselves infants. They were then ignorant of the ways of wisdom, knew not good from evil, until bitter experience taught them. They would then have returned, but alas! Cherubim and flaming swords guarded the tree of life, and they were destined to wander over the earth and select the healing balm from the vast variety of trees and plants which were thickly sown over its face. Having no criterion by which to distinguish the good from the bad, the false from the genuine, until the effect determined, they committed a multitude of errours, which have continued to be committed over and over again by their posterity ever since. We must begin as it were *de novo*. We must begin with a strict inquiry what there is in our present system of things which is incompatible with virtue; also what there is which is good. This is no trifling inquiry. We must trace back each to its origin, point out its effects; if good, unite in embracing it; if bad, throw it away. In this inquiry we must not be guided by theory, but by experience, which we must consider an infallible test. Brethren, the magnitude of this work may seem discouraging. But if we cannot perform the whole let us perform what we can; be cautious what we teach our children and be strictly on our guard, lest they imbibe some pernicious habit which will forever debar them from the paths of wisdom and virtue.

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

NO. II.

THE TRINITY.

In prosecuting the Essay on Christianity I shall not be governed by the *order* of inquiry which was stated in the notice I published, but shall commence with the Trinity, though my

readers may be assured each of the subjects, mentioned in that notice, will be discussed in the course of our inquiry.

The Trinity, from the prominent rank which it holds among doctrines reputed Christian, from the high degree of importance which it is supposed to possess, as well as from its own abstruse nature, is justly entitled to the first place in a disquisition of religious dogmas. A belief in this dogma is considered, by a large proportion of the Christian world, as not only essential to the holiness of one's life, but absolutely necessary to avert the wrath of God, and to save the soul from eternal perdition. It is considered the grand pillar of Christianity, the chief corner stone of that spiritual temple which the prophets, the apostles and the pious in every age of the church have been ambitious to erect. As every one wishes for happiness both here and hereafter, none can reasonably refuse to examine a dogma possessing such a powerful recommendation, and such imposing claims.

It is truly lamentable to the philosophick and to the benevolent mind, that mankind should have so long wandered in search of truth without once getting into the right path, or that they should have wasted so much time and exhausted so many brilliant geniuses in fruitless attempt to investigate subjects which must forever elude the reach of our senses or the power of our comprehension. Had mankind at first known, what subjects they might have studied with profit and what they could not, or in other words had they at first known the circle which bounds their observation or which fixes the limits of their knowledge they had been at this time far advanced in the acquisition of wisdom. Had this been known the human race would never have been perplexed with so many absurd theories of religion as have spread over the earth with little other effect than to scandalize the Divinity and make enemies of brethren. The time which has been employed in the vindication or in the refutation of vague and contradictory dogmas, might have been usefully employed in the developement of the various phonomena of the natural world, and in the acquisition of useful knowledge.

But ignorant of nature, man disdained to consult the objects which were contiguous to his situation, impatient of knowledge he could not submit to the slow and tiresome process of observation and experiment, but with a boldness honourable indeed to the sublimity of his mind, he rashly leaped into the empyreal sphere, determined to survey the throne of the Almighty and from its lofty eminence to give laws to the Universe. Unmindful of earth he was engrossed with heaven, neglectful of his own constitution and of the conduct necessary to procure his own and his brethren's happiness, he attempted to explore the depths of the Divinity, and to scan the counsels of Jehovah. Inattentive to the importance of knowledge which might be made subservient to the purposes of life, he invoked the genius of Faith, and deemed it the summit of his hopes, and the purity of his life *to believe*. The evil consequences of this grand mistake are not to be numbered. Inquiry has been diverted from her legitimate course, and the mind has been wasted and the understanding destroyed, to learn that which, if learned, would be useless, but which must forever mock his impotent exertions.

Ignorant that "the proper study of mankind is man," he vainly asked and attempted to answer the question, "what is God?" The question is involved in impenetrable darkness. Thousands of answers have been given, but all are equally unsatisfactory. Whether the mighty Energy, the mysterious Power which pervades the whole of nature and enables the Universe to present its various and ever varying phenomena, be a Being separate from matter or inherent in it; whether it produced and arranged the vast machine, or be the result or aggregate of all the laws by which matter is actuated; whether it acts by intelligence or a blind necessity—are questions which baffle all our powers to answer, and which is the correct, man cannot by all the faculties nature has given him, ever ascertain.

If then he knows so little of God, how can he pretend to explain the mode of his existence, or state the number of persons who participate his Divinity? From the study of nature, he cannot ascertain that there is a God, much less that God exists in a three-fold form, or in other words, that there are three persons in the God-head, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, equal in power and glory, the same in substance, perfectly distinct and independent of each other, and yet constituting but one God. Nature never taught this, or that part of nature which is open to *our* view, never taught and can never assure us it is true. If true, the evidences of its truth are not found among things which we know, nor with which, by our own powers, we can become acquainted.

The subject is enveloped in thick darkness, an impervious vail hides it from our sight, and to investigate it we require the aid of another sense, one which can detect the spiritual world, converse with immaterial existences, tell us what they are, how they are made, and what forms they bear. But such a sense we have not. Some may pretend to it, but man, as such, does not possess it, and has no reason to expect that he ever will. From nature there is no evidence in its favour. It is not a doctrine of nature, and consequently is not supported by natural reason. But this is no argument against its truth. It may however be a strong argument why we should not believe it. But as we cannot be so vain as to suppose that whatever is, is present to our sight, or that we

know all the possible modes of being which may exist in the infinitude of space; it would be in the highest degree absurd for us to pronounce any being a fictitious one, merely because, in our observations, we have never seen it.

But it is proper, that in this place, we caution ourselves against a practice which many theologians seem highly to admire. The argument addressed to our ignorance is too often used, and many, when endeavouring to support dogmas which refuse the cognizance of sense, or which extend beyond the province of reason, are extremely apt to infer their truth from the fact that we do not know them to be false. But though our ignorance may be a good reason why we should not pronounce a thing false, it is a poor one indeed why we should call one true. Every man, who affirms a position, should offer in its support, affirmative evidence, and his failure to do this, may always justify the conclusion, that he has none to offer. And no man is bound by the laws of evidence, to believe an assertion because he does not know it to be false. He that makes the assertion must prove it, or we may reasonably reject it.

Our ignorance, respecting such a being as a "Triune" God, is no argument against the truth of the assertion, that there is such a Being, neither is it any argument in favour of such assertion. If there be no facts to prove his existence, we are under no obligation to believe; and if we must be sent to endless woe under these circumstances for such a disbelief, we shall doubtless go without guilt or remorse. But if the dogma in question contradict facts which we know, or which are plain to our senses, we are not only not bound to believe, but absolutely bound to reject it.

It is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be. I have two books before me; they are *two;* and I should consider myself justified in telling any person, he was deficient in common sense or common honesty, who should assert they were *one.* For such an assertion is at war with the plain testimony of my senses, and I know it cannot be true, because it denies the existence of one book which I know lies before me. Should the Trinitarian tell me that God is three persons, and yet but one person, I might justly reply, your assertion is false, for it is impossible in the nature of things that *three* should be one, or that one should be three. And if he should vary his phraseology, yet express the same thing, if he expressed any thing, I should be warranted to make the same reply.

The Trinitarian indeed complains of the paucity of language, and declares that he is unable to find words to express his ideas of this sublime mystery. It may be so; but perhaps the difficulty is, he has no ideas to express. Language, I believe, is adequate to express most, if not all, of the ideas the human mind can conceive; at least I have found no difficulty. I have always been more troubled to obtain ideas, than I have to find words to communicate them. The Trinitarian is much attached to his peculiar dogma; he is extremely desirous of making it intelligible, but it is beyond the power of man to make a thing which is not, intelligible by any form of words which he can devise. No matter how much labour he bestows upon the child of his affection, if nature has not made it reasonable, he cannot make it so. The probability in regard to the Trinity, is, that it is unintelligible and unreasonable or contradictory.

If the Trinitarian will assert there are three Gods, his assertion is tangible. It becomes a matter of fact, and testimony may be adduced to establish its correctness. But if he assert these three Gods, or rather three individuals, are but one God, he asserts that which implies a physical impossibility. He may say these three individuals are of the same substance, or that the same substance which constitutes the being of one, equally constitutes that of the three; but this assertion would destroy the idea he would wish to convey. Identity of substance may be understood of sameness of kind, that is, the substance which constitutes the being of three men may be the same or of a like kind; but this definition, if admitted and applied to the Trinity, would prove there were three Gods, as much as it does that there are three men, who have a common nature, or who participate the same substance; and it would make it just as improper to call the three divine persons one God, as it would be to call the three human persons one man.

Identity of substance, in its strict sense, implies that three individuals have not a like nature, do not partake of similar substance or one same in kind, but one actually the same in every particular of which we can form any conception. Say here is a lump of clay. The potter takes one third part of this and makes it into one vessel; out of the remaining two-thirds, he makes two more. Here was one lump of clay divided into three parts and made into three distinct vessels. It would not be absurd to say these three vessels are one or the same in substance, understanding the sameness to be in kind, and not in the identity of particles.

But we cannot apply this reasoning to God. We know nothing of his substance. He is said to be immaterial, and consequently indivisible. Might we hazard an idea on a subject so inscrutable, we should say it is impossible to suppose three distinct persons to partake of that which is necessarily one and the same wherever it be found. For we cannot conceive of any distinction which can exist between the persons. Say God is pure spirit, and that the whole of this spirit, however

widely diffused constitutes the whole of the Divinity. This Divinity is God. Call it Father, call it Son, call it Holy Ghost, or call it what we please, it is the same individual—the same indivisible God or Divinity. The Trinity is nothing but a word and the distinction for which the Trinitarian contends, is a distinction in expression only and not in reality.

Does the Father possess any attribute which does not belong to the Son? or do the Father and the Son possess any thing which does not belong to the Holy Ghost? Every Trinitarian answers no. How then are they distinguished one from the other? It is in vain to talk of a distinction without a difference. And the Trinitarian but tramples upon his natural apprehension of things whenever he attempts to advocate both the oneness and the plurality of the Godhead.

If he would say the three persons in his God, were one in design, one in their general pursuits and in their labours, whether of creation, of providence, or of salvation, he would be consistent in this respect. His unity and plurality would go very well together; for though they were many in one sense, they might also be one in another sense. But this would be Tritheism, and the Trinitarian abhors the idea that there are three Gods as much as does the most strenuous Unitarian.

Any conclusion different from this will destroy all distinction of persons in the Godhead, and the Trinity will dwindle down to different displays of Almighty Power, Wisdom or Goodness. That is, if we look at God as the Creator of the world we term him Father; if as redeeming the world from sin and misery, we term him Son, because his dealing is with the sons or children of the Father; and if we look at him as by his power or life-giving energy raising us from the death of sin to the life of holiness we term him the Holy Spirit. Perhaps reason could not discover any inconsistency in our statements if we should assert this, but alas for the Trinitarian, his dear *something*, I know not what, would be no more.

But it is unnecessary to dwell longer upon the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the dogma under review. Its advocates do not pretend that it is a doctrine of reason. They consider it a bible doctrine; and as such they contend for its truth. Before we proceed to an inquiry whether it be really taught by the bible or not, I must be indulged in a digression for the purpose of disposing of some questions which naturally arise out of the state of the case. And I may as well tell the reader in this place as in any other, that I am not very fond of system; and that my way of presenting my essay in detached parcels, will permit me to attend to the questions which are excited, by the way, rather than to discuss them all at once.

The Trinity is an unreasonable dogma, or, at least, it is not taught by reason, and it actually is, if it mean any thing, opposed to our natural apprehension of things, and seems to contradict some of the first principles which are the foundation of all reasoning. But without deciding in this place whether it be reasonable or unreasonable, we are provoked by the assertion that it is not a doctrine of reason but of the bible, to inquire how far this sacred book is to be considered authority for a doctrine which is unreasonable. To answer this inquiry, we must answer several others which we propose to do, before we proceed farther in the examination of the Trinity.

EDITOR.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

"A STRANGE THING!!"

Some kind friend, we know not who, has favoured us with a precious little Tract, called "A Strange Thing." We have read this through. And though we consider it sophistry and nothing but sophistry, we are well aware that it is not every one, that can discover the fallaciousness of its reasoning. Probably the Orthodox have seldom produced "a thing" which has better answered their purpose than this aforesaid precious little Tract.

The design of the tract is to disprove Universalism. "I find," says the writer, "by conversation with my neighbours, and from the perusal of books and pamphlets which they are frequently putting into my hands, that there is an opinion extensively prevalent that all mankind will be saved. Those with whose views I am best acquainted, generally believe that there is no punishment after death. Sin it is thought involves its own punishment. Consequently, when mankind cease to sin, as it is supposed they will at death, there will be an end to all their sufferings. This opinion appears to me *strange*, not because it is entirely new, but because it is inconsistent with so many other things which I have long considered as facts, and which, so far as I know, have been considered as facts by others." This is indeed strange but not conclusive. There is, to say the least, a bare possibility that universal salvation may be true, notwithstanding it may be "inconsistent with so many other things," which this writer "has long considered as facts" or which have long "been considered as facts by others." We presume, if this writer belongs to the human family, and we have good reason to think he does, that it is very likely he has long considered many things as "facts" which a closer inspection might ascertain to be unfounded.

But the first thing which seems *strange* to this writer is, "the *solicitude* which the apostles manifested for the salvation of their hearers. They conversed, and preached, and prayed, and laboured, as though they were deeply concerned for the salvation of their fellowmen." All this is true but we see nothing strange in this. But if the apostles believed that all men were

to be saved why were they so "deeply concerned" is the strange thing which the writer cannot account for. Why not? because there is any thing more unaccountable than we every day witness? The authour of this little tract might, perhaps, mark something equally strange at our day; and among preachers and would be apostles too.

Is it not *strange* that our Calvinistick friends who believe that the number to be saved is "so certain and definite that one cannot be added or diminished" and secured too by a decree of God from all eternity, should nevertheless manifest that great *solicitude* which they do, for the salvation of the "elect?" Is it not *strange* that our orthodox friends should be at such immense labour to beg money from poor kitchen maids and from persons who need all their earnings for their own support or to pay their honest debts, for the purpose of manufacturing such vast quantities of *tracts*, and that they should be at so much trouble and expense in sending off load after load to be distributed for the salvation of souls, when according to their own views every man's destiny was irrevocably fixed, by the decrees of Heaven, before he was born? Is it not *strange* that mankind should labour so hard for a little something to eat and to wear, when death in a few days will place them beyond the reach of want?

We think it is not difficult to perceive the stumbling-block in the way of our authour. He, like most of his orthodox brethren, has his mind so engrossed with eternity that he has forgotten time, and his so great anxiety to ensure salvation in the world to come has made him think no happiness, to be enjoyed here, should claim the least solicitude. He thinks doubtless, as many say they do, that if our eternal felicity after death be sure, there can be no just occasion for any exertions to meliorate our condition in the world where we now reside. This is an errour fraught with much injury to the prosperity of religion and with the most deleterious consequences to the peace and welfare of the earth.

Fatal mistake! We quit our own sphere, we rush headlong into an unknown world, waste our time and strength in useless efforts to fathom the depths of eternity. The earth is neglected. The pressing affairs of time are turned aside to follow the imagination, or to listen to the vagaries of a bewildered brain. Society lies a rude uncultivated waste. The knowledge, which might enable us to call forth its latent powers and make it productive of all that can cheer and gladden the heart, of all that can fasten the warm affections and awaken the pleasing emotions of which we are succeptible, is neglected and every thing, which would have a direct tendency to make earth a paradise, where all its inhabitants should be united by the strong cords of mutual love, is considered unworthy a wish or a thought. The consequences of this mistake are, that the evils of which our forefathers complained are not removed. Man still continues the enemy of man, and the greatest plague and tormenter of his kind. The whole catalogue of crimes and vices, which disgraced antiquity and made sorrow fill the hearts of the people and wretchedness their habitations, still rages with nearly their primitive force, while the *pious* are grasping at an ideal world and consoling themselves with fancied visions in a world which they cannot, to say the least, enter till after death. War and rapine still continue to desolate and impoverish nations. Petty evils, in all their nauseous detail, spread over the land now as well as formerly. And why? shall we waste our breath in idle declamations against Fate, attribute them to the decree of God, to the malignity of matter, or to the depravity of the will? No. The cause is an errour in judgement. The very errour implied in the objection we are considering. The authour of this little tract like most of his brethren can see no adequate cause for the *solicitude* manifested by the apostles without supposing they believed mankind were in danger of an endless hell. This supposition is founded on a wrong estimation of things. We see a world lying in wickedness, we see them plundering and devouring each other; we see a world lying in wretchedness, over-run with false systems of religion, distracted by the multiplicity of their gods and groaning beneath the burdens imposed by their spiritual tyrants. Did we believe we had in our possession a remedy for all these evils, should we not be justified in manifesting the utmost *solicitude* to persuade our unhappy brethren to use it?

Our readers will suffer us to dwell on this point, for they are well aware, the question is frequently asked by the advocates of endless misery, "if universalism be true what is the use of preaching?" If all mankind are a going to be saved, what necessity of being virtuous here? Though I have often smiled at its weakness, yet there are many who consider it an unanswerable objection to universalism. Suppose we should adopt the same principle of reasoning, if reasoning it can be called, into common life? Friend, what is the necessity or what is the use of your eating your breakfast this morning? you will have a breakfast next week and you will be just as well off then, or after you have then eaten, as you would have been if you had eaten *this* morning. Our friend might smile at our question, but it is most likely he would eat his breakfast without condescending to give us an answer. But if he should answer he would say, "I eat this morning and shall continue my regular meals, from this time till next week that I may enjoy myself until then." We doubt if orthodoxy with all her ingenuity could find any flaw in his reasoning, should he make such reply; and we say to all such questions, that we think the use of preaching and the benefit of being virtuous, is, that we may be happy here. Because we are assured we shall be happy after death, we do not choose to be miserable till then; and because we are assured we shall feast on the bread of life in the kingdom of God, we do not prefer a perpetual fast while we are sojourners on the earth. To us it seems *strange* that the orthodox should talk and write as they do; or upon second thought it is not strange. They have so long been accustomed to forget earth for heaven, and to inflict the severest woes upon mankind here that they may be happier hereafter, that it is indeed no wonder they consider hu-

man happiness below, as entirely beneath their care. Any man who will calmly look at the situation of mankind as they were when the apostles preached, who will mark the corruption which then prevailed, the intolerance, bigotry and superstition of religionists, which was encouraged by the various theological and mythological systems which were then embraced, and will duly consider the misery they occasioned, will not, we think, be much surprized that the apostles, benevolent and compassionate as they were, should manifest the *solicitude* they did, providing they expected to benefit mankind only in this life. Should the apostles present themselves to this age, we believe they would be nearly, if not equally, *solicitous* about correcting the evils and abuses which have crept in among us, as they were to reform the world when they acted on its theatre.

Man does not live for himself alone. He lives for posterity; and the happiness or misery of the generations which are to succeed us, depends in a great measure upon our choice. Should we all embrace the Christian religion and be happy in consequence of so doing, would it not be worth something? We believe, if twelve men should accomplish it, by wearing out their own lives, there would be enough more happiness follow, to overbalance the pain and anxiety the twelve would endure. But this is only a small part of the gain. Our children, or the generation immediately to follow us, would gain more than we should, and the generation next to follow still more, and thus on throughout all generations. But this will warrant no *solicitude* except it be for eternity? We think differently. To this object we have devoted the most of our life, and have felt as much solicitude to make mankind happy here, as the orthodox manifest to make them happy hereafter. We think the world might be soon reformed if men generally would manifest as much solicitude to be happy in this world, as they do to gain another.

(To be continued.)

MR. RAINS' COMMUNICATION.

We publish in this number a communication from Mr. Aylett Rains, who was formerly a preacher of Universalism, but is now a preacher of the "ancient order of things," or of something else, we know not what. We conclude, however, that not finding with us what was necessary to arouse the "energy" of his mind and awaken the boisterous passions of his hearers, he has embraced the truth as it is in A. Campbell. We have no fault to find with him on this account.—He is at liberty, if he thinks best, to embrace Campbellism, or any other *ism* he please, but we can see no mighty advantage in Campbellism, if a man means to be honest. What does A. Campbell believe? what does he advocate? We care nothing about what he believes or what he advocates; but we like frankness. We wish every man would state his sentiments clearly and specifically. If Mr. Campbell's sentiments are true, why not let them come before the world in a tangible form?

Mr. Campbell and his party declaim against sectarism, condemn all sects and are, so far as the writer of this knows any thing about them, as violent sectarians as there are in ours or any other country in Christendom. They have no creed, forsooth; but if every one does not understand the bible according to their construction they brand him "sectarian," and heap upon his back all the epithets of reproach, found in the Jewish or Christian scriptures. They have no articles of Faith, indeed; but if one is not plunged all over in a "mill pond," or some other fountain of water, the curse of God will rest upon him. "They are liberal," it is said. No doubt of that: we never saw a bigot but what was liberal enough to let one believe just like himself. A Campbellite will no doubt call you brother, if you will agree to condemn what he condemns and to approve what he approves. But enough! the controversy is in other hands, and we do not intend to interfere. All we say, is that we think there was no need of so long a communication to settle the question whether the Deity will love a man more for being put all over under water, than he will if he stays on dry land. Disguise the question about baptism as much as we please, and this is its amount.—Ask experience, does it make a man any better, more useful to himself and more benevolent to the human race? If it does, baptize, and the oftener the better.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. RAINS' LETTER.—NO. II.

Mr. Everett.—"There is one Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy," and if any man will not hear him, that man "shall be destroyed from among the people." This Lawgiver is Jesus Christ, and Christians are all "under law to him." This Jesus, after his resurrection from the dead, and consequently after he had "blotted out the hand writing of *ordinances*," and all ordinances which were obligatory on those who lived under the Mosaick economy, instituted by law, the *ordinance of water baptism*, and commanded his disciples not only to preach the "glad tidings," but to *baptize* the disciples, and to teach all the disciples to be baptized. "All authority," said our Lawgiver, "is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."—Matt. xxviii. 18, 20. And again—"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel unto every creature. He that believeth and *is baptized* shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 15, 16.

This law of *baptism*, sir, was enacted by a being who had been previously to the enactment of this law, invested with all authority in heaven and in earth; and baptism was, in the estimation of this Lawgiver, so important,

that he not only taught his disciples to *baptize* all nations, but he commanded them to teach all nations to be *baptized;* for *baptism* was certainly one "thing" among the "all things," which he had commanded them to teach.—Now, sir, I should be glad, if you would tell us whether this law has ever been repealed; and if it has been repealed, tell us who it was that repealed it, and why it was repealed, and when it was repealed, and whether this was the only law of Christ which has been repealed. Do, Sir, give us what information you possess upon this subject. If you can prove that the law of Christ relative to baptism, has been repealed, many an old sinner will rise up and call you blessed, and you will be hailed by practical Atheists as a luminary of the first magnitude, in the frigid heaven of Universalism. But be cautious, sir, in this matter, lest while you attempt to set aside our baptismal law, you infringe upon some other laws very closely connected with it, and establish premises agreeably with which every law of Christ may be supposed to have been repealed on the same principle. And remember, that if you cannot prove that the law of Christ has been repealed, so far at least as it relates to baptism, it will continue to stand as an impregnable wall between you and your brethren in this country, and your little attempts against us, will be as ineffectual, as would be the efforts of school boys to batter down ramparts of brass with snow-balls.

That the primitive Christians considered themselves as being "*under the law to Christ*," is a fact which you will not deny; and that they considered baptism as having been established by law, by the great Head and Legislator of all Christians, is a fact to my mind equally incontrovertible. Else why did the apostles practice it among both Jews and Gentiles, in Judea, Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth? If *baptism* was considered by them as constituting a part of the Jewish ritual, and as being one of the "divers washings" under the law, why was it instituted after the law was abrogated by the death of Jesus? and why did not the apostles protest against it, as you do, and as they did against circumcision? Is it not most astonishing, that they should have permitted a "*beggarly element*" to remain in the Church during the whole of the apostolick age, without either uttering or writing a syllable against it? Ah! had Mr. Everett been there with his "Gospel Advocate," which I think will be found to be a *Gospel Adversary* before long, he would have lampooned these apostles into a more strict observance of their duty, and the long lapse of ages intervening between Pentecost and the year A. D. 1828, should have resounded with his refined protestations against "beggarly elements," wind and "water," "frogs and magicians," &c. &c. &c.

"Tarry at Jerusalem," said Jesus to his disciples, "until you be endued with power from on high." Hence we find them on the day of Pentecost, "with one accord at one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." Thus, sir, were those disciples baptized with the Holy Spirit and fire, and thus did God indue them with power from on high; for it is said in the 5th verse of the 1st chap. of Acts, "But ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." And in the 8th verse, he says, "ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." This baptism of Holy Spirit and fire, was truly miraculous; and all its accompaniments were miraculous displays of the mighty power of Jesus, who, "having been by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he" (says Peter) "hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." Acts ii. 33.

Now it requires nothing like a miraculous power in us, to enable us to perceive that Jesus was the sole administrator of the baptism of the Holy Spirit and fire. Neither does it require any great share of sagacity, to enable us to determine, that our opponents cannot show us a word of testimony in support of the old hackneyed and Quakerish notion, that the apostles were to baptize people with the Holy Spirit, or that Holy Spirit baptism was to be perpetuated in the church. When Peter preached to the people who had assembled at the house of Cornelius, they were baptized from heaven; for says Peter to his Jewish brethren, "The Holy Spirit fell on them, as on us in the beginning."—Acts xi. 15. But that any of the race of Adam, ever were, or ever will be baptized with the Holy Spirit and with fire, except those mentioned in the two cases above, is a supposition in support of which, I can find no testimony. Do tell us, Mr. Everett, have *you* been baptized with the Holy Spirit and with fire? Have you been endued with miraculous power from on high, as those were in "old times," who were baptized in this way? You tell us in your reply to my first letter, on your 332d page, that God baptizes, "not with water," but with the "Holy Ghost and with fire." Can you prove that God ever baptized any person in this way, since the day on which Peter preached at the house of Cornelius? Surely the age of miracles must have returned, and the

"Holy Spirit must have selected the Universalists" of the eastern states, "as the special subjects of its care!" And Mr. Everett believes in miraculous conversions, does he? Yes, conversions by the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit!! For says he, "God baptizes with the Holy Spirit and with fire." You have heard a sound as of a rushing mighty wind, have you? And this filled all the house where you were sitting? And you have seen cloven tongues as of fire sitting upon each one of your baptized converts? And you have heard them speak different tongues without having learned them at school? All these things you must have seen and heard, in order to be justified in saying that "God baptizes with the Holy Spirit and fire." For Peter said, "He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." The accompaniments of this baptism are such, that the Spirit can be *heard*, and the fire can be *seen*, and a whole congregation of spectators, with their natural ears and eyes, could hear it and see it. When I read your marvellous notions about Holy Spirit baptisms, I really could not but fear, that you were so much "inflated with wind," that the event would be with you, such as it was with a certain amphibious animal mentioned by Esop, which, though it was not afflicted with "*canine madness*," was troubled with a kind of windy malady equally as distressing, and which peradventure might have been cured by going into the "*water*." Be so good, sir, as to prove that "*hydrophobia*" is a "*canine*" malady exclusively, before you animadvert any more on my use of the term. I used it just as I would the phrase "*dread of water*," and just as innocently as I would have used that phrase. My opinion was, and is, that this dread originates in weakness, and cannot be subdued, except by our having in view the definite object and benefits of water baptism as mentioned in the New Testament.

[*To be continued.*]

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

Our good, cautious and charitable Presbyterian priest of this village, Mr. Stow, in giving notice of a funeral discourse which was delivered in the Baptist meeting house, on a Sunday of this month, says to his congregation: "I am requested to give notice, that Mr. Badger is to deliver the discourse—a *Christian*, a denier of the divinity of Christ." As if he had said—"My dear congregation, you must not attend the funeral of your deceased neighbour this afternoon. The preacher does not believe as we good orthodox Christians do. He denies our creed; he denies our mystery that Christ the Son, is his own Father; and you must not attend. We will have an opposition meeting here this afternoon. *I* will tell you the *truth*, and you must come and hear me."—*That's all.*

OBSERVER.

Elbridge, January, 1829.

SELECTIONS.

PUBLICK MEETING.

The measures adopted by the pretended friends of religion and morality, are beginning to awaken our citizens to their true character and obvious tendency. We have ever been of the opinion, that there were too much virtue, patriotism and intelligence among the inhabitants of this country, to tamely submit to the unchristian and anti-republican exactions of a "certain order of divines." We are pleased with the calm and dignified, yet determined manner in which the several publick meetings, which have been called on the subject, have met the late project to stop the mail on the first day of the week. The spirit which breathes through their addresses and resolutions, augurs well. We copy from the "Peoples Press," Batavia, the address and resolutions of a publick meeting lately held at that place, as superceding any thing we might offer ourself.

EDITOR.

ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN: This meeting has been called for the purpose of remonstrating against a petition lately in circulation, intended to be presented to Congress, praying that a law may be passed to prohibit the transportation of the mails, and the opening of the post offices on the first day of the week, called Sunday. In connexion with this attempt at imposing restrictions upon the regular transmission of intelligence, is the recent establishment of a new line of stages, called Pioneer Line, intended to run in opposition to the old line of stages and to lie still on Sundays, originating primarily in the recommendations of a certain order of Divines, who have come to a determination to bestow upon it exclusively their patronage and support.

This subject will admit of two general enquiries, or considerations:

1. What are the best received opinions of the institution of the Sabbath, or the seventh day of the week as a day of rest, and what are the changes and obligations that have been introduced by Christianity.

2. In what general estimation are religious functionaries held, who endeavour to convert church discipline into a system of influence for the promotion of any other purpose than that of the diffusion of religious knowledge?

In conducting these inquiries, we have consulted some of the most approved authors upon the subject; and it will now be proper to direct our attention to the first branches of our inquiries, which is the original institution of the Sabbath, or seventh day of the week, and how far the christian world is bound to conform to it.

The origin of the Jewish Sabbath is plainly indicated in the second chapter of Genisis, in which the divine historian informs us that, "on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had

rested from his work, which God had created and made." Gen. ii. 2, 3.

After this, for the period of twenty-five hundred years, there was no command given that the seventh day, or Saturday should be observed as the holy Sabbath, or day of rest: nor was it observed as such till the sojourning of the Jews in the wilderness, when to relieve their necessities, manna was sent for their subsistence, which was found in the field on every day of the week except the seventh, on which no manna fell; and in consequence it was necessary to collect as much on the sixth day, as should be necessary for their subsistence for that and the succeeding day. At this time the divine command was first given in these words: "See for the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day, the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." Exod. xvi.

This appears to have been the first institution of the Sabbath, and it was not long afterwards established with great solemnity in the fourth commandment. Previous to this period there appears to have been not the least allusion to it in the general history of the Jews, nor was any permission given to dispense with the institution during the Jewish captivity in Egypt, when the Sabbath as a day of rest appears not to have been observed. But under the subsequent Levitical Law a capital punishment was provided for its violation in these words. Whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.—Exod. xxxi. 15. The Sabbath day as here intended, is the seventh day of the week, and therefore if christianity has not abolished the Jewish Sabbath, it would follow, that those who work on Saturday are liable to this punishment. The Jews and the seventh day baptists keep the seventh day as the true Sabbath, which they consider themselves bound to observe.

The institution of the Jewish Sabbath appears to have been abolished by the primitive Christians; as Saturday, or the seventh day, to which the observance was confined, is not at present set apart as a day of rest, and consequently it appears to be a well established opinion that "if the command by which the Sabbath was instituted be binding upon Christians it must be binding as to the day, the duties and the penalty; in none of which it is received." St. Paul indeed considered the Sabbath as a part of the Jewish ritual and not binding upon Christians as such. Col. ii. 16, 17.

In the abolition of the primitive Sabbath there appears to have been no new command given for the observance of a day of rest, or for the discontinuance of the common occupations of men. As the Jews preached in their Synagogue every Sabbath, so it became the practice of the primitive Christians to set apart the first day of the week for the purpose of holding religious assemblies for public worship; because on that day Christ first appeared to his disciples after his resurrection; and though there does not appear in any part of the New Testament any authority for these convotions, or religious meetings on that day; yet the circumstance that the day *was* changed, and in that change the Jewish Sabbath *was* abolished, carries with it a forcible presumption, indeed positive proof, that the observance of the Christian Sabbath, instituted as a day for religious meetings, originated in some precept of Christ or his apostles, which has not been recorded or promulgated as a law. There is no command to observe it as a day of rest nor any penalty attached to its violation as such.

That the Saviour considered all days of the week alike as to the performance of good works is evident from this circumstance. There was a man with a withered hand that Christ was about to heal on the Sabbath day. The Pharisees asked him if it was lawful to heal on that day, to which he made this memorable reply: "*Is it lawful to do well on the Sabbath day.*"

This may be considered as a positive command delivered by the Saviour, and the performance of good works on the Sabbath becomes an indispensable obligation. He that will suffer his property to be destroyed without an effort to save it on the Sabbath, or his neighbour to suffer when his aid might relieve him, does not conform to the precepts of the Saviour.

It follows then that all acts of an indispensible nature, whether publick or private, working no injury to any one, but beneficial to all, ought never to be intermitted. The suspension of the Mails would work a national evil; it would expose men of business to great inconveniences; sacrifices of immense value might be sustained; and even the interests of religion itself might be impaired.

They ought never to remain twenty-four hours at rest. If they did, they might be purloined, or robbed of property in notes to an immense amount. Great temptations would often be thrown in the way. Besides they might be burnt; and therefore they would be much safer to be constantly in motion, which would save this additional risk in transmission.

We will now advert to the second branch of our enquiries, which is, the estimation in which those religious orders are held, who seek to render church discipline subservient to any other purpose than that of religious instruction, and as this is forcibly illustrated by an eminent writer we will quote the passage entire.

"The authority of a church estsblishment is founded on its utility, and whenever, upon this principle we deliberate concerning the form, propriety, or comparative excellency of

different establishments, the single view under which we ought to consider any of them is that "of a plan of instruction," the single end we ought to propose by them is "the preservation and communication of religious knowledge." Every other idea, and every other end that have been mixed with this, as the making of the church an engine or even an *Ally* of the State; converting it into the means of strengthening or diffusing influence; or regarding it as a support of regal in opposition to popular forms of government, have served only to debase the institution, and to introduce into it numerous corruptions, and abuses."

[PALEY.

From these remarks it is evident that an ecclesiastical interference in the ordinary affairs of life brings not only an odium upon religion, but those of the clerical profession, who neglect their duty as religious instructors by undertaking to controul temporal concerns.--- This thirst for power, so apt to be perverted to the worst of purposes, has done more to injure the cause of religion than all the works of deistical writers, who have made a direct attack upon revelation.

The evil tendency of this exercise of power is distinctly seen. It foments hostility, engenders party strife, creates jealousies and a determined spirit of opposition; all which are injurious to the true interests of religion.

The great and important privilege extended to us by our institutions is religious freedom. We are responsible to no man for our private opinions, subject to no penalties on the grounds of our religious faith---and every attempt to impose restraints upon our conscience, if not a direct is an indirect violation of our constitution.

But while we are contending for religious freedom, let us not overlook the interests of religion-- it is all important that that should be supported. We should consider it an indispensable obligation, to conform to the religious ordinances of the christian faith, to frequent places of publick worship as far as circumstances will permit. Let us cultivate a spirit of devotion, and resignation to the Divine Will. Let us delight, not in forms and ceremonies and empty ostentation, but in good works. Let us revere the religious institutions of our country. Let us cherish an implicit belief in the christian dispensation—it is the sure foundation, on which our hopes of future happiness can rest.

The committee then reported the following preamble and resolutions.

Whereas, we have witnessed, with deep regret, a disposition, in a portion of our fellow citizens, to unite the common business occurrences of life, with religious and spiritual matters, and to agree with each other to bestow their patronage on such as are favourable to their own particular views; and to withhold all business intercourse from those who dissent from them in opinion—seeking to disseminate and establish the belief that such measures are inculcated by religion and morality—and that neither can be sustained without concert and combination—thereby corrupting the sublime and dignified character to which *these* moral virtues are justly entitled; and converting them to purposes temporal and worldly, and to the acquirement of individual gain;—all of which, in our opinion, virtually tends to the establishment of an odious monoply, speciously moral in its character, but in its details and operations, corrupting and debasing, and highly prejudicial to the rights and interests of a large portion of our most respectable fellow-citizens; and which, if not speedily checked, and effectually discountenanced by the good sense of the people, will become a hideous monster, which will acquire power without right, and denounce without mercy,—a thing absolutely hostile to the mild and charitable precepts of our holy religion, which commands us to "do unto others as we would that others should do unto us;"—subversive of morality, because the incentives which it holds forth to the community to become virtuous, have their origin in selfishness and fanatical prejudice—calculated to encourage hypocrisy, because, by threats and denunciations it makes proselytes, without asking of the novitiate any further obedience to the requirements of religion and morality, than outward demeanour can furnish, and because it derives support by appeals to the temporal interests rather than to the moral principles of men—promotion of discord, because, it tends to the gradual investiture of power in ecclesiastical functionaries, inconsistent with the civil authority, and which it is found will eat away and consume our civil and religious liberties—intolerant and arbitrary, because it defends itself from all just attacks, not by inherent merits which it possesses, nor by submitting itself to a just and discriminating scrutiny—not by giving demonstration of the charity and good will which it professes towards all men; not by a disinterested benevolence which gladdens the thankful heart; not by that meekness of temper without which no man can be truly good; but by broadly denouncing every man who dares to arraign its justice, as an "atheist, a deist, a heretick, and unbeliever in the faith and a reviler of religion."

And whereas we have been informed and believe that divers memorials have been and are about to be presented to the Congress of the United States, remonstrating against the transportation of the mails of this state, and particularly upon the great road leading from Albany to Buffalo, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, and demanding that a law should be passed prohibitory thereof: And, whereas, we believe that the increasing

business in this section of the state requires that daily intercourse should be established, and kept up between us and the great metropolis, through the intervention of the mail, and that such a measure will not be detrimental either to the growth or perpetuity of our moral and religious institutions, therefore,

Resolved, That we revere the principles of Religion and Morality and that each should hold a prominent and distinctive place in the heart of every man: but should never be used as a cloak for hypocrisy nor in furtherance of our temporal good.

Resolved, That all religious or sectarian associations or combinations, having for their object the advancement of temporal interests, are subversive to individual right, and endanger the civil institutions of our common country. In proof of which, we need but to cast our eyes to degraded, bigotted and oppressed Spain, to Catholick Ireland; and to the tax-ridden land of England.

Resolved, That we applaud the efforts of good men in causing religion to be respected and morality to be observed; but that neither object can be effected by coercive or arbitrary means.

Resolved, That the increasing business transactions of this section of the state require the transmission of the mail between the city of Albany and the village of Buffalo; and that its transportation cannot in our opinion, effect injuriously the morals of that community thro' which it passes, nor interrupt the devotions of those who are truly devout.

Resolved, That liberty of conscience and liberty of speech are two invaluable legacies, transmitted to us by the wisdom and intelligence of our forefathers, and guaranteed to us by the Constitution; and it is the right of all men peaceably to assemble and temperately declare their opinions upon all subjects, whether religious or temporal, without incurring the denunciation of any men.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the chairman and secretary, and that the several publishers of newspapers in the county of Genesee, be requested to publish, in their respective papers, the preceding preamble and resolutions.

Resolved, That the committee be instructed to request of Judge Stevens a copy of the address delivered to the meeting, for publication; and that the same be published with the preamble and resolutions.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be transmitted to the member of Congress from this District.

J. W. STEVENS, *Chairman*.

D. H. CHANDLER, *Secretary*.

MORE PETITIONS.

It is expected that all the Jews in the United States, with the Sabbatarians, will soon present a petition to Congress to stop the passage of the Mail, and the opening of Post-Offices, on *Saturday*, the seventh day in the week, and the true Sabbath spoken of in the scriptures.

Others, it is supposed, will present a petition to the same effect, touching *Good Friday*, it being thought inconsistent with the character of a moral and religious people, that secular business, of any kind, should be done on that day.

The Roman Catholicks may be expected to petition that the Mail be stopped on Ash *Wednesday*, and not only on this day, but through the whole term of *Lent*, a period of forty days. But should Congress ordain that it run at all during that time, they will pray that it be on Sunday, as this is a day in which, during this holy fast, they permit the most indulgence.

Others, it is supposed, will petition Congress to arrest the Mail on Christmas; and all New-England, the land of steady habits, will unite in insisting that Fast Days and Thanksgivings be not desecrated by the revolving wheels of a Mail Coach.

The different petitioners will sustain their respective prayers by the trite maxim of our government, that no preference is to be shown to one sect over another, and that the religious scruples of the different sects are alike to be respected.

All these petitions will furnish Congress with as much business as it can attend to, previously to the 4th of March.

RESIGNATION.

There is no virtue more acceptable to God, and in practice, more conducive to human happiness, than resignation to the divine will. He who presumes to question the wisdom, the goodness, and the paternal solicitude, for the felicity of man, of the Supreme Being, is guilty of the most heinous of crimes, and deserving of the most severe punishment. That wisdom, which is displayed in the economy of the vast system of creation—that goodness, which every page in the volume of nature exhibits in language the most forcible and endearing—that paternal solicitude which the scheme of redemption and pardon so gloriously illustrates, should silence every murmur when we are afflicted, and teach us to consider that we are chastised for the most benevolent purpose, and corrected that we may be worthy of those unfading joys for which we are ultimately designed. The globe is not constructed for the eternal abode of an eternal soul. We should view all its perplexities, as equally short-lived and transitory. He who uses the good things of this world, without abusing them; whom prosperity cannot elate, who puts a just value upon what he possesses, and is ready to resign the blessing which he is favoured with into

the hands of him by whom they were bestowed, (when the requisition made is an object of divine complacency,) will surely receive an abundant reward. Resignation can alleviate the distress of this life, calm its varied troubles, pour a ray of comfort to enliven the vale of tears through which our pilgrimage must be made, and cheer with consoling expectations the gloom that lours over the pillow of death. Who then would have the hardness to doubt the justice of the dispensations of Providence, or arraign Omniscience at the tribunal of human presumption?

We trust the Address and Resolutions of the Publick meeting, lately held at Batavia, relative to the project for stopping the mail on the first day of the week, will be read with interest. The mere stopping of the mail or closing the Post-Offices on that day, is but a trifle. It is only designed by those who love our souls, but our CASH more, to accustom our legislative councils to priestly influence and clerical dictation.—Americans! be on your guard. Reverence religion, but see that your crafty, spiritual demagogues do not corrupt your government and destroy your liberties while they are pretending to support piety and morality.

We return our thanks to those of our agents and friends who have exerted themselves to swell our subscription list for the seventh volume. Perhaps much more may be done, and we trust those who approve the doctrine we attempt to support, will not be backward to encourage their neighbours to read for themselves, and also to patronize a work which labours to vindicate every man's rights, and to reconcile all to their Creator, to themselves and to each other.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"Plain Truth" has been mislaid. It shall appear as soon as found. "Christianity" No. 4, shall appear in our next. A communication from "Senex" shall also appear in our next.

We have a press of matter on hand, but shall dispose of it as fast as we find room. The review of Sellon's Sermons will be continued in our next; and a series of essays on Divine Goodness will be commenced in our next or soon. Our Essay on Christianity is commenced, and our readers must recollect that we are calculating to open a wide field of discussion—they must not be disappointed if they have to receive several numbers before they discover the extent of the field to be surveyed.

We are frequently asked, "Is G. W. Brooks a preacher in fellowship with the Universalists?" To avoid the frequent repetition of this question we give this notice that we know no such man as George W. Brooks as a Universalist preacher. A man by that name did indeed once have the fellowship of our associations, but he has of his own accord withdrawn and published to the world that he is no longer in fellowship with us, and we are satisfied that he has withdrawn.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Many of our friends have been anxious to obtain Pickering's Psalms and Hymns. The Publisher of this paper has them now for sale; also a Sermon by the Rev. S. R. Smith, entitled "True Believer's hatred of the world." Together with most of the popular works of Universalists, and a variety of pamphlets designed to elucidate or defend the doctrine of the final holiness and consequent happiness of all mankind.

OUR WESTERN SUBSCRIBERS.

From many of our subscribers in the western states we have received no returns during the past year, and many are yet indebted to Mr. G. Tuttle, for the 5th volume of the Advocate. This is probably owing in some cases to the removal or neglect of agents, and in others, to the difficulty of transmitting money. We have a numerous list of subscribers in Louisville, Ky. and Cincinnati, Ohio, most of whom are indebted for two years Advocate. If our former Agents in those places neglect to act, we hope our subscribers will devise some means of sending us our dues. Any information from our friends in either place will be thankfully received.

In cases where U. S. bills cannot be conveniently procured, we will receive bills of any specie paying banks, which are current in New-England, New-York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, North and South Carolina, Georgia or Virginia.

Money owing to G. Tuttle for the 5th volume, and to the present proprietor for the 6th and 7th vols. of the Advocate, may be forwarded together in the same letter.

In places where arrearages are due, it is desirable that our agents, if we have any, should give us the earliest information of the state of our affairs, to prevent the expense of postage incident to our writing to each individual subscriber: And in case we have no Agent who acts, we wish some one of our patrons to act in behalf of the others, and we will allow such a fair per centage for the trouble of collecting and transmitting money. We consider all our old subscribers responsible for the present volume, who neglect to return the first number, or give notice to Post-masters of discontinuance. PUBLISHER.

ADDITIONAL AGENTS.

Joseph H. Connover, Agent, Dayton, Ohio; *Parley Brown*, West-Richmond, Ontario co. N. Y.; *Col. S. Cummings*, Batavia, Genesee county, N. Y.; *Rev. L. Knap*, Brighton, Monroe co. N. Y. *Rev. H. Sampson*, Parma, Monroe co. N. Y. *G. F. Wilson*, Bethania, Stokes county, N. Carolina; *Dr. F. F. Calmes*, Poplar Grove, Newbury Dist. S. C.; *Rev. A. Vandenburgh*, La Fayette, Onondaga co. N. Y.; *William Stone*, Scriba, Oswego county, N. Y.; *Stephen Goddard, Esq.* McDonough, Chenango county, N. Y.;—*J. H. Ellis, M. D.* Virgil, Cortland co. N. Y.; *David Emery*, Winfield, Herkimer co. N. Y.; *Peter H. Warren*, Columbia, Herkimer co. N. Y.; *Rev. S. Adams*, Smithville, Chenango co. N. Y.

Poetick Department.

FROM THE PHILADELPHIA EVENING POST.

EUPHRATES.

Math. xiii, *from* 24 *to* 30*th verse inclusive.*

'Twas on the rich banks of Euphrates' stream,
Jehovah, omniscient, all-wise and supreme,
First stationed Adam in Eden's sweet bow'r,
With Eve his companion, a delicate flower.
He sow'd their young bosoms with seed in their youth,
Of virtue, benevolence, wisdom and truth;
And on the same ground where the choice wheat was sown,
The tares by the tongue of the serpent were thrown:

'Tis plain to be seen, that the heart is the ground
Where truth and deception are both to be found;
These are the two seeds which the human heart bears—
And all that is meant by the wheat and the tares.
The servants of old saw it not in their day,
How God his great goodness to man would display:
They saw not the depth of that wonderful plan,
Which wisdom had drawn for the welfare of man.

These servants saw tares (in the wheat) bearing fruit,
Said let us go pull up each tare by the root;
The mild voice of reason, replied no, forbear,
Lest you in so doing the wheat should impair,—
Let both grow together 'till ripe in the field,
That man may partake of the fruit they both yield;
That by their effects he may well ascertain,
That truth yields him pleasure, and falsehood gives pain.

Man early imbibed false notions of God,
Supposed him a tyrant and vengeance his rod;
The hand of tradition, e'er since man begun,
Has borne the delusion from father to son.
The Father of Mercy his bosom unfurled—
Sent Christ to bear witness of Him to the world;
Invested with wisdom and virtue to prove,
That God was Eternal, unchangeable love.

His healing the sick, and his raising the dead—
His feeding the hungry with meat, drink and bread—
His casting out devils—restoring the blind—
All prove Him who sent him a friend of mankind.
The Jews disbelieving in him, they began
To seek the sweet life of that innocent man;
Condemned him unjustly to hang on the tree,
And bear the keen anguish of death's agony.

The earth was convulsed, her bowels distress'd—
The heavens in mourning appear'd to be dress'd—
The stars, and pale luna, and sol's rolling flame,
All shrunk from beholding the death of the Lamb.
The love that inspir'd him, while he was on earth,
Was stronger, ten thousand times stronger than death:
Love prompt'd him to finish the task that was given,
Rais'd him from the dead to the mansions of heav'n.

By this we discover that mankind shall have
A lasting existence beyond the cold grave;
Remov'd from a state of corruption like this,
To dwell in perfection's soft bosom of bliss.
The first dispensation pass'd off, and the new
Unfolded a scene of bright glory to view;
The banner, bright banner of truth was unfurl'd,
The ensigns of peace and good news to the world.

The harvest appears, lo, the fields are all white;
The reapers went forth in the first dawn of light:
The reapers are those, whom our God doth inspire
To gather up falsehood and burn it in fire;
The spirit of Truth is the sickle so keen—
The illuminous flame is the fire which we mean:
The temple of Friendship and Love is the place—
The mind when refin'd of the whole human race.

FROM THE NEW-YORK MIRROR.

STANZAS.

Cling not to life, thou dreamer!—soon
Its fitful visions pass away,
And at night's pensive hour, the moon
Will smile above thy wasting clay.
True, when its buds are fair and bright,
When joy, like hope, within thee springs,
Thou reck'st not of the coming night,
Where death his shadowy mantle flings.

But there's an hour, when all must come,
With faint delay to thy sick heart,
With clouds of cold oblivion's gloom,
Whose mournful pall may ne'er depart.
Yes—it must come!—the hour of death,
With its chill mildew on thy cheek,
With anguish in the struggling breath—
Vain words, which nature may not speak.

Cling not to earth—thou who hast given
Thy heart to love's deep mysteries—
Thou who hast found as pure a heaven
As dust can find beneath the skies;
Launch not thy bark upon that wave,
And gaze not on that flowery shore,
Alas! how soon the insatiate grave
Will quench thy raptures evermore!

Ay, ere the light hath beamed, a cloud
Will gather in thy being's sky;
And hope will fade in the dim shroud
Which hangs o'er mortal destiny:
Loves mild, warm sigh be soon forgot,
Grief's burning tear for joys will fall,
And o'er the sweet "forget-me-not"
Will twine the night-shade's coronal!

Cling not to life—it hath a ray
Which waken love and hope to dwell
In the young heart a little day
Then fades the rapt, enchanted spell!
How doth time's lagging tide roll on,
When their charmed days have ceased to bless!
The light of gay existence gone,
Clasped in oblivion's chill caress!

Oh, let the soul its sorrows bear,
But cling not to life's changeful road.
How sweet to roam, in spirit, where
We drink the peace which springs from God!
There is a faith, whose every beam
Is like a voice in mercy given,
Which bids the soul no more to dream
Of fading earth, but cling to heaven. W.G.C.

Where is the American woman that has ever written any thing worthy of being compared with the following?—*Eds. New-York Courier*

HEBREWS—*Jer.* 10, 17.

From the hall of our Fathers in anguish we fled,
Nor again will its marble re-echo our tread,
For the breath of the Siroc has blasted our name,
And the frown of Jehovah has crushed us in shame.

His robe was the whirlwind, his voice was the thunder
And earth, at his footsteps, was riven asunder;
The mantle of midnight had shrouded the sky,
But we knew where he stood by the flash of his eye.

Oh Judah! how long must thy weary ones weep
Far, far from the land where their forefathers sleep?
How long ere the glory that brightened the mountain,
Will echo the exile to Siloa's fountain?

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. Doubleday, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1829. [NO. 3.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON
ON FAITH AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 16.

Most religionists depend on faith, and estimate the worth of a man's character from the firmness with which he believes certain notions, and from the zeal and perseverance with which he labours to support and extend them. From time immemorial, it has been deemed absolutely essential to the holiness of one's life, that he believe what his spiritual guides tell him is the will of God, and that he embrace, with all the ardour of his soul, certain propositions relative to the unknown being called God, and to an unknown world called heaven or hell. One's faithfulness in all matters of trust—his rigid justice in giving every one his dues—his tenderness to the feelings and consciences of those with whom he is associated—his readiness to relieve the distressed, to soothe the afflicted soul, and bind up the broken heart—his general benevolence which leads him to do good unto all men as he has opportunity, together with high attainments, or great mental endowments, avail nothing in the estimation of the pious, if he do not also embrace, as the one thing needful—the creed which from its popularity, is denominated orthodox, or sound doctrine.

This sentiment, supported by however respectable authority, has had the most injurious effect on man individually, and on society collectively. Supported by it, the priest has bound a "threefold cord" around the hearts of those who looked to him for direction, which has irresistibly drawn them to support his interest, at the expense of their own and other's good. By it, he has produced a servile and imbecile disposition of mind, as deleterious to society generally as it is degrading to the individual. Authorized by this sentiment, the professed man of God, has vented his own wrath and hurled the anathemas of the Almighty against the peaceable, the moral and apparently the most benevolent and humane members community can boast—has torn society assunder, spread ruin and moral desolation, and converted the otherwise happy world, into a miniature picture of what, he, following his gloomy imagination, painted as the eternal abode of the damned.

This sentiment—this idea that one's holiness depends on his faith and not on his works, has fostered spiritual pride—made him, who fancied himself sound in doctrine, feel himself superiour to those who were so unfortunate as to believe differently though their conduct was in the highest degree useful to the world. It has elevated him in his own conceit, and induced him, standing upon the pinacle of his imagined dignity, to look down with contempt upon his superiours in virtue, and exclaim, "stand by, I am more righteous than you."—It has given respectability to the knave and clothed the hypocrite with sanctity. It has furnished a mask for the villain and enabled the most abandoned, the most profligate and the most vile, to triumph over the wisest and best, and to have their names enrolled in the registers of heaven and themselves to be canonized as saints for the worship and imitation of mankind.

This sentiment, and its necessary appendage, that no one can hope for happiness in the world to come, who is not orthodox in his creed, is that which has kindled the flame of persecution, which has fired the zeal of the holy warriours and armed them with fury against those deemed heretical in their faith.—It is that which enveloped the middle ages in thick darkness, relieved only by the fires which consumed the wretched victims of clerical rage. It is that which erected the Inquisition and confined thousands in its cells—which tore the husband from the arms of his wife, the son from the embrace of his father, the daughter from the affection of her mother, and burned them for the glory of God and the good of souls.

It is this sentiment, now advocated by almost every one who pretends to religion, that severs the cords of fraternal affection, alienates the hearts of kindred, that destroys mutual confidence, and produces most of that bitterness, hostility, backbiting and defamation which now rage to such an alarming extent, and which are so deeply regretted by every benevolent soul.

From every quarter we hear the confused roar of religious discord and contention. Society weeps the injury she receives from this

fundamental errour. Virtue stands aghast—honesty calls in vain for admission, and humanity, or the disposition of heart which would lighten the load of common misery and irradiate our countenances with the smile of felicity, is compelled to shed her tears in secret and breathe her prayers to the winds. A merciless demon, who quaffs with joy the blood of hereticks, who laughs at the widows tears and mocks the orphan's just complaint, reigns as god, and commands the homage of the deluded multitude.

"Believe or you will be damned"—"*believe or you will be damned to all eternity,*" is the watch word of the spiritual corps. "Believe or you will be damned," is the text, is the beginning, is the middle and end of every sermon, which orthodoxy, in frantick rage, thunders from her ten thousand desks, and "you are blasphemers of God," "enemies to all good and revilers of every thing holy,"—are the honourable epithets you will receive from her charity, if you have the audacity to question the correctness of her assertion.

And what is worse, vain man—weak, presuming man, pretends all this is done by the command and for the glory of God! Impious wretch! dost thou think thou art obeying the command, or adding to the glory of God, when thou art destroying the happiness of his children? And thinkest thou the God of heaven, the God of nature, Creator and upholder of an infinitude of worlds and of beings, regards thy opinion, brother of the worm and offspring of the clay? Of what weight is thy opinion, poor vain thing, in the great scale of Wisdom? and of how much importance to Omniscience, thinkest thou, will be thy opinion, whose feeble knowledge scarce spreads an inch around? And thou wouldst murder thy brother, and damn his soul forever, merely because he does not happen to believe as thou dost? This is obeying the command of God? this is adding to the glory of God? Go, grovelling creature, lick dust with the serpent, but raise not thy eyes to the sun lest the impartiality of his rays which give light and warmth alike to the believer and to the unbeliever, should reprove the contractedness of thy notions, and the intolerance of thy feelings! Mark not the falling shower, nor the universal supply which nature yields for all her children, lest thy soul should breathe a purer air, and thy mind be compelled to acknowledge "the Lord is good unto all and his tender mercies are over all his works."

Alas! nature is discarded—the voice of reason is made dumb before implicit reliance, and ancient prejudice, recited by the priest, overpowers every consideration which might tend to enlighten the mind, enlarge its views and make it think more honourably of God, and more benevolently of men. The bible is quoted, and presumptuous man would feign make the voice of God bear witness to that, which if true, would make Deity worse than the imaginary king of hell, and creation but a proof of his wrath and malignity. God cannot reveal, he cannot say that which would destroy the happiness of his creatures. God never did and never can, if he be a being of goodness, command any man to destroy the happiness or the life of another; nor can he be glorified by the cruelty and intolerance of his children. But here comes in my text as a supposed refutation of what I advance: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Grant this text means what popular sentiment contends; that it plainly declares, that all who do not believe on the Lord Jesus in this life, shall be eternally damned in the world to come; grant this, and look at the consequences—yes, weep for the consequences. Go to the Indian, bowing before his Brama; to the Thibetian, adoring his god Lama;—threaten him with eternal woe, if he does not bow before your Jesus, and believe what he has taught; go tell him this, and mark his sarcastick reply: "Who is this Jesus? why you have some new god. His name, his character and his doctrine, are equally unknown to us; and is this his disposition to damn all who do not believe his doctrine whether they have ever seen him, heard him, or heard of him, or not?" Justify your sentiment, ye would-be-saints, in the eyes of enlightened reason, or be silent.

Shall the heathen, who have followed the light vouchsafed to them by nature's God, be eternally damned, because they have not believed what they never heard? And you would, ye wise ones of the earth, boast of the compassion of your Saviour; you would call your God good, and yet have us believe the heathen—the old, the young, the middle-aged, and infants will be eternally damned, because they have not performed an impossibility! You would convince us of the mercy and loving kindness of God by exhibiting for our amusement the picture of mothers with their infants, wives and their husbands burning in a lake of fire, writhing with anguish, begging for help, but in vain; while God mocks, angels laugh, and saints clap their hands with joy, and shout hallelujah? And *this* you would persuade us is justice? JUST! to burn the tender infant, to overwhelm the mother with keener anguish at the misery of the loved one of her bosom, and burn herself too, because forsooth she has not believed what she has never heard, nor never has had an opportunity of hearing! Gracious Heaven! when will men think of thee as they ought!

You need not go to the heathen to find those that shall be damned, if this sentiment be true. Look on thy infant, fond mother. O, I know it is dear to thy heart. Thou hast depicted on

its cheek all its father's greatness, and all its mother's loveliness. It smiles. I see thee hug it closer to thy bosom, while all the mother burns within thee. That infant shall be torn from thy bosom, snatched from thy arms. It shall be plunged into a lake of fire and thou wilt see it! *Thou* wilt see its hands, its feet, its body swell with pain: those eyes, on which thou art now looking, thou wilt see start out with anguish: those lips—thou art kissing them now—will call, *call*, CALL in vain for a mother's voice and the maternal kiss to sooth its pain and lull it to rest. Yes, *thou* wilt see this, and if thou dost not believe thou wilt, thou shalt burn there thyself.

This is not all: Every man, every woman and every child, are, at some period or other in their lives, unbelievers—all unbelievers must be eternally damned: all without exception then must burn eternally in that lake of fire! Weep, O heaven! and clothe thyself in sackcloth, O earth! Death eternal, death universal, shall prey upon the human race.—Jehovah has failed in his design—Christ has died in vain—saints have prayed with fruitless breath, and the whole race of man have lived and toiled for nought! Why this sad catastrophe? Because we have not done that which we could not do. We have not believed without hearing or having evidence to convince our understandings that what we hear is true.

I cannot look upon this painful result and persuade myself that those, whose sentiments inevitably lead to it, are aware of the fact. They feel vexed that their neighbours do not believe like themselves, and actuated by this vexation, they suppose God has the same feeling, and having also the power, will damn these wretches to all eternity. But let them forget this vexation and look calmly at the subject; and ask themselves, if they believe that the sun which shines over our heads and shoots his transcendant beams upon our earth, is a ball of ice? Suppose some superiour being should command them to believe the sun is a ball of ice, and threaten them with an eternal hell, if they did not, could they believe any more on that account? They could not. Suppose the same or some other being should command them to believe, that light does not follow the appearance of the sun in the east, and should threaten them with an eternal hell, if they believed that it did, could they believe differently from what they do now? They could not. What then is faith?

Faith is the assent of the mind to the truth of some proposition. If the proposition be made in terms the mind can understand, accompanied with evidence enough to convince it the proposition is true, it believes and it cannot help believing. Under any other circumstances we do not believe. We may say we believe, but we do not, we cannot. There is then no merit in faith or in believing, nor demerit in disbelieving. To save a man then for believing, is saving him for doing that which he cannot help, or which he could not have avoided, and if one is damned for not believing, he is damned for not doing that which he could not do—a course of conduct I dare not ascribe to my Father and my God.

Hence the mistake of those who expect eternal felicity in the kingdom of heaven as the reward for their having believed. Faith is not the thing which merits eternal salvation, and are we to believe that we shall be rewarded with eternal life for that in which there is no merit, or that we shall be eternally damned for not having that which is deserving nothing, which also has no merit? The religious world continues to cry—"*believe!*" "The devils believe and tremble;" are they any the better for that? The religious world are expecting eternal life as the reward of their believing.—Scripture asserts, "eternal life is the gift of God:" let them read and understand. God has *given* us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. God has given this record of his Son, (see 1. John v. 11.) Let those who call themselves his favourites, beware how they charge him with falsehood.

What then is the meaning of our text?—Simply this: Christ commanded his disciples to go into all the earth and preach the glad tidings of the reign of God unto every creature: he, or any one, that should believe, or have confidence in the declaration or doctrine proclaimed, should be saved, or should be cured or freed from sin; but he that should not, would be condemned or remain in condemnation, for every one that is not in Christ, or that has no confidence in his doctrine, is condemned. But there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. Hence they are saved from their sins, from the bondage in which they were through death; hence they are free.

The text is plain. It states a simple fact—what would be the consequence of preaching the Gospel; and that it is a fact, interrogate experience. Go to the disbeliever of the gospel, and what is his situation. You may see him shrinking from the presence of a God he fears but cannot love. He is conscious he has done wrong—sensible he has wandered from his God and that his affections are alienated from his heavenly Father, and he therefore fancies that God hates him. He is wandering in the mazes of ignorance, wretched and despondent. He dare not look to God, for he paints him in his gloomy imagination a being, powerful, armed with vengeance, delighting to hurl his forked lightenings at his offending children and determined to pursue with infinite wrath until he sinks them to the nethermost hell. The poor sinner is convinced of the folly of his course; he knows no sublunary arm on which he can lean and find support; he fears

to look to his God, through dread that deeper misery awaits him there.

Wretched is the condition of him who does not know Jehovah as revealed by Christ, the common Father and the common Friend. He cannot enjoy himself with society, for his vices have destroyed their confidence. He trembles at every thought of death, for he knows not what "dreams may come" in that world which he must enter. He starts back from the grave, fears eternal woe, or the cold, unending sleep of non-entity, may be his doom. Hence he lives in perpetual bondage through fear of death.

The believer is made free. "Inasmuch as the children were made partakers of flesh and blood, he [Jesus] took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who all their lifetime were subject to bondage through fear of death." This Christ has done by bringing life and immortality to light, by assuring us, though we die we shall live again, and because our Saviour lives we shall live also. The soul, the moment this is believed, is freed from the bondage under which it before groaned. It no longer looks upon death as a curse, but as the gate through which it must pass to enter the kingdom of its God and the apartment of its felicity. The corroding power of conscience is destroyed—sin is ended; righteousness reigns in the soul & all is peace and full of delight. God is no longer feared as a tyrant, no longer avoided as an enemy, but loved as a Father, a Friend, a faithful Friend, and a bountiful Benefactor. If affliction comes across the soul, if the world be unkind, he can draw pleasure from himself and consolation from the confidence he has in divine protection.

The Christian who has made himself acquainted with God, who has learned from Christ, that God is his Saviour, that God will redeem him from the corruption of this world to enjoy a heaven of bliss, is happy—has a *present* salvation of which the unbeliever is deprived. This is the salvation spoken of in our text, and is a salvation which comes by faith—is the consequence of faith, not its reward. It is great, it is glorious; the soul thus saved, only knows how great and how joyous! O, the Christian knows and he would not part with it for worlds. It calms our fears, calls into exercise the noblest and the best feelings of our nature, and prepares us for the highest degree of enjoyment of which we are susceptible in this mode of being.

But the unbeliever is condemned, not indeed because he does not believe, but because his deeds are evil. He has not that confidence in God requisite to call forth the virtuous principles of his nature. Knowing not the goodness of God, he is destitute of one of the most powerful inducements to reformation. He therefore plods on in his wickedness, verifying the assertion, that "the way of the transgressor is hard, that there is no peace to the wicked, but they are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt." His condemnation is what he suffers *here*, not what he may suffer hereafter. If he is wicked, it is not because he does not believe, but because he does not perform acts of righteousness; and if he is unhappy, it is not a punishment for his unbelief, but because he is destitute of that consciousness of his own integrity and virtue, and of that confidence in God which are necessary to produce his happiness. Beware of unbelief, not because it is criminal, but because you will thus lose a powerful stimulant to virtue. Cultivate faith in the Lord Jesus, not because faith is meritorious, but because it will have a tendency to make you more virtuous. May God grant us all that confidence in truth which shall make us all happy and virtuous.

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

NO. III.

ON THE USE OF REASON.

It is a singular circumstance that we should be under the necessity of settling the question how far we shall consider the bible authority for an unreasonable doctrine, and we should not have been reduced to this situation had it not been repeatedly urged that reason has nothing to do with matters of religion. Both the advocates and the opponents of reason seem to have misunderstood the subject in dispute, or at least, each other. The mistake has doubtless been occasioned by the ambiguous manner in which the word *reason* is used. Thousands cry out against the use of reason and perhaps as many exclaim in its favour, who, if they had understood each other, would have been agreed.

The term *reason* is susceptible of different meanings, according to the manner in which it is used. It may be used to signify the thinking faculty, whatever it be, or that power by which we perceive the relation of different propositions, and by which we are enabled from certain premises to deduce or infer certain conclusions. It is often used to signify the same or nearly the same as argument; the thing sought or desired to prove a point or position. And not unfrequently it implies the motive or causeof a thing or effect, as we say, the *reason* why such a thing is. But when I term a doctrine unreasonable, I mean that it is inconsistent with our natural perception of things, or our own experience. Reason I consider that faculty by which we perceive the relation of different propositions, and which enables us to determine whether the relation supposed to exist between them, does exist or can exist

without destroying either. We know that twice one is two, and we know also the assertion that twice one is one, is false, therefore unreasonable. We know, so far as our experience extends, that it is the nature of love to make its object happy. We should therefore not hesitate to pronounce the assertion false or unreasonable, that should say love will of its own accord inflict misery upon the object of its affection. From the term *love* we obtain a determinate idea, and if we convey any idea by the same term, except the one appropriated to it, that idea should bear another name. "Deity loves his creatures." By this we mean that he is delighted with his creatures, and is pleased to make them happy. This is what we mean by love. Now, should any one say that Deity will make these same creatures endlessly miserable; I answer, reason assures me, he can never do this, unless compelled, till he cease to love. I am positive in this conclusion, because I know the nature of love. I know it never will make its object miserable unless compelled by a power it cannot control. Should I be told this indeed may be true so far as it regards man, but may be false when applied to Deity, I still reply that it can be no more false when applied to God, than when applied to man. If we mean the same thing by love when the term is used of God, as we do when used of man, my conclusion is correct. If something else be meant, that something else is not love, and should not be expressed by that term but by some other.

Reason should always be heard, and no system should receive a moment's attention, but to be discarded, that contradicts it. The only difficulty in the case, is, to ascertain what is reason. Reason must undoubtedly have some data. But what are the data from which we are to reason? "The voice of God," says he who claims intimacy with Jehovah. "God has spoken and it is the sublimity of human reason to believe." But I cannot assent to this proposition, in principle, though I might admit it in some of its details. Should I hear a voice from heaven asserting that the two men I now see walking are but one man, I should not believe it, because I have the testimony of my senses, (the strongest evidence I can have in the case,) to the contrary. Should the same voice declare to me, love and hatred, joy and sorrow, good and evil, pleasure and pain, are the same, I should not believe it; because my own experience irresistably compels me to believe contrary to such declaration.

"But this," it is said, "is to set up one's own reason against the declarations of God." The remark is incorrect. We do not set up our reason against God. Have not I the testimony of my senses that I *see* two men walking? and have I any thing more than the testimony of my senses that I *hear* a voice from heaven declaring the *two* to be but one? I have not; and if I believe one rather than the other, it is only because I choose to believe the testimony of one sense in preference to another. If I believe there are two men, I believe what I *see*, in preference to what I *hear*. I do not disbelieve that I hear the voice, but I disbelieve its correctness. But how do I know the voice I hear is the voice of God? Do I see God? If I did, and should hear him assert that which contradicted the plain testimony of my senses, I could not believe him. But God has not made such a declaration, and if he be a Being of truth he cannot. But should he make such a declaration, humility might induce us to conclude there was some misapprehension in the case, or some play upon words. Deity might use language in a sense different from what I did, and the apparent falsity of the declaration might result from my misunderstanding the declaration.

We have the bible. We are told the bible is the word of God. Be it so. We have no disposition to question its inspiration or its divine authenticity. But for the sake of illustrating our argument, we will assume a case. Say then it is ascertained that water is a compound of hydrogen and oxygen—that it is ascertained by a variety of experiments which have established its certainty as positively as any thing we can establish. Now should the bible declare water to be a simple substance, which should we, which ought we, according to the nature of evidence, to believe? Believe that water is a compound, is what I should do in such a case though ten thousand bibles declared to the contrary.

All faith must arise from intuitive perception, experience or from testimony. Intuition is undoubtedly the strongest evidence we can have. This is what irresistably compels us to believe our own existence, to trust the intelligence of our senses and which at first thought, without any process of reasoning, leads us to admit it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be, that a whole is greater than a part, &c. The evidence of experience is the next in order. This comprizes whatever *we* have seen, heard or felt. And unquestionably it is easier for me to believe that which I have seen, heard or felt than it is for me to believe what another tells me he has seen, heard or felt. I may, perhaps, believe, on the testimony of another, the stories which have lately been told about the Sea Serpent, but had I seen the Serpent myself I should certainly have stronger evidence of his existence than I now have. Hence I am to believe the testimony of my own senses in preference to the senses of others, and perhaps the testimony of a man I know and have always known to be a man of truth, than of one who lives at a great distance of time and place, whom I have never seen and who I do not, by any personal acquaintance, know to be a man to be depended upon.

The bible comes under the third class of evidence. It is the evidence of testimony, not of experience nor of intuition. Consequently can never authorize us to believe what contradicts our experience or our intuitive perception. "But," it is replied, "God cannot lie, therefore what ever he says must be true." We grant it. "But have we any right to inquire into the reasonableness or unreasonableness of what the bible teaches?" Certainly: for, though God cannot lie, man, who can and often does lie, is the only authority we have for believing the bible is the word of God. I do not mean those to whom the bible was given had no stronger evidence than the testimony of a fallible mortal for believing it the word of God, but that we, who live at this late day, have no stronger evidence than human testimony.

It may be alledged numerous miracles were performed to establish the truth of the declarations of scripture. This will not be denied, but we have not seen those miracles and we have nothing more than the testimony of individuals whom we have never seen, and whose names in many instances we do not know, that any ever did see them. The testimony which the bible affords is the weakest kind of evidence, and can never be admitted when confronted by stronger. We should make a distinction in this place. A thing may be beyond our reason and not opposed to it. In all cases of this kind the bible is infallible. Other things may be opposed to reason; we know no authority sufficient to establish the truth of such things. A thing which contradicts our intuitive perception or our experience, we should at once pronounce false. Should it be asserted that a part is equal to a whole, that black is white, or that pain is pleasure, we may pronounce such assertions unfounded. But should it be asserted that Jesus Christ rose from the dead, we cannot pronounce it false, because we do not know that it was true, we know not but there is a law of nature which may produce such a result; and if the testimony is such as would command our assent in other extraordinary cases, we are bound to believe. Let this distinction be preserved and there will be no difficulty. What contradicts reason or experience, our intuitive perception, or our own knowledge, we are to reject, bible or no bible: what is beyond our reason or experience, may or may not be true. We shall in our essay consider the bible decisive on all questions of this nature.

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

AN ESSAY ON DIVINE GOODNESS.

NO. I.

Mankind are often timorous creatures.—They are afraid to hear any thing advanced contrary to their own preconceived notions. I must, however, ask my readers not to be startled at any thing I may advance in the following essay; for it is my design to elucidate, and defend the goodness of God from all the objections which have been urged against it. But I shall commence by stating these objections in all their strength and in all the force I am able to give them. We pay a poor compliment to truth, when we misrepresent or ridicule her opponent. To reason fairly is to give to the arguments on each side all the strength and all the cogency of which they are susceptible. I shall urge the objections to the goodness of God, give these objections all the colour of truth to which they can pretend, and also do my best to remove them.

It is not necessary for me to attempt to prove the existence of some superiour Being, or of some mighty Energy which pervades the whole of nature and enables it to perform its various operations. For the existence of such Being or of such Energy is sufficiently evident to every one who will make use of his senses and exert his own understanding. But what this being is, as to his essence or substance of his existence we know not, we cannot ascertain, therefore it is useless to inquire. How this being exists we know not, and his physical connexion with the universe it is impossible for us to explain. We can affirm nothing of the secret power which is every where to work, for we know nothing. All we can affirm is that we see various events transpire, and various changes in the natural world constantly taking place; that the mind is variously affected with joy or sorrow, with love or hatred, with pleasure or pain, all which we believe are the result of some cause. All we can do is to analyze the various effects we discover in the world of matter, and the various emotions, passions and affections of which we perceive the mind susceptible, and to trace all these to the immediate, to the remotest antecedent in our power, and there rest our inquiry and stay our investigation. We can state the phenomena which have presented themselves to our observation, but whence they originated, or upon what external power they depend, is more than we can, from the exercise of those powers we find allotted us, in a single instance ascertain.

Nature is. Nature is wonderful. Wonderful because we know not how it came or how it is supported. We see that something exists. We cast our eyes abroad—behold a world adorned with every thing that can fascinate, and filled with every thing pleasing to the senses and gratifying to desire—we look, lost in admiration, we ask "whence came this beautiful, this magnificent fabrick?" Accustomed to attribute every thing we see to some cause, which precedes its existence, we accordingly at once infer that the world owes its origin to some cause which has produced it.

But so great, so beautiful and so systemati-

cally arranged is the universe, that we easily conclude the cause producing it must be powerful and intelligent. I believe this conclusion correct, but I do not *know* it. The world is, this is all I know. I have never seen its beginning, nor do I know it will ever have an end. We may believe what we think we have evidence to believe; but whether the world had a begining or will have an end, or not, is more than *human* knowledge can tell.

I make these remarks, not because I intend pursuing the difficult questions which they excite, but merely to awaken the attention of my readers to their own powers, and also that they may learn their own weakness. Man should ascertain his own strength, should know his own weakness, that he may not remain inactive, nor attempt to scan subjects which must forever baffle his power to grasp.

I said it was not necessary for me to attempt to prove the existence of an Overruling Power. It is not because my readers do not doubt his existence. If they did doubt his existence I should not attempt to prove it, because I do not feel myself adequate to the task. I believe in the existence of a God: but I do not believe it because I think *nature* sufficient to teach his existence, but because I believe he has revealed himself to the world in his word.

Many a sincere christian believes he can prove from *nature* the existence of a God. He may, but I cannot. What is nature? Nature is whatever is. It is the universe, with all its furniture of worlds, with all its inhabitants, with all the force and laws by which the whole is governed. Nature can prove nothing separate from itself; and should it prove the existence of a God, that God would either be nature or a part of nature. This is the same as Atheism. The Deity, according to the notions of all intelligent theists, is independent of the universe. He existed "Omnifick and alone." Now nothing we can see teaches this. The universe cannot teach this, for it cannot travel out of itself, and travel out of itself it must to prove that a being existed before it, and still exists independent of it.

I believe there is a God; but I take my belief from scripture. Or rather scripture affirms his existence, and nature assures me the existence of such a being clearly accounts for the existence of the objects I admired. One difficulty is removed. I know how the universe came—revelation has told me, hence its importance. My views are enlarged. I do not indeed know the whole, but I have learned a part. I am told there is a God, who made the world. How he came, indeed, is not told. But say he was, there never was a time when he was not. Something must have always been or nothing would now be. The supposition of the existence of a God removes one difficulty, answers one question, how did the world come? And if it proposes another which it does not answer, it is attended with less difficulty; for it is easier to suppose the eternal existence of such a being, than it is to suppose that what we every day see changing and varying its form, if not its qualities, has been from eternity.

I rest the existence of God on this. I see nothing in nature which appears able to originate the idea of a God in my mind. But since revelation has informed me there is a God, every thing in nature bears testimony to its truth. Revelation originates the idea, nature *proves* it, but could not of itself have taught it.

Taking it for granted, on the authority of revelation, that God is, the most important question which can occur is, what is he? or, what is his character? This question is important, and we design to answer it; not indeed what God is as to his essence or the substance of his existence, but what is his character, or, what his mode of dealing with his creatures, good or bad.

All Christians, and indeed all Theists, however illegitimate their conclusions, answer with one voice, "God is good." This is the assertion of our text, and no one who believes in a God feels any disposition to contradict it. But is he good? The existence of evil presents itself as a prominent objection to the goodness of our Heavenly Father. I take it for granted that Deity is infinite in wisdom and in power. The bible declares this to be a fact, and none who believe that, will question the position. Evil seems an imperfection.—Pain is not a proof of perfection; and the fact that there is much misery in the world, seems a strong proof that the world is imperfect. But why did a Being possessed of infinite wisdom and of infinite power make an imperfect world, unless he designed that it should be a miserable one? If he designed it a miserable one he is not good—for no good Being designs misery or evil. But if the idea that this is an imperfect world be denied, and it be said it is perfect, it is still worse; for then we must say, it is just such a world as Deity designed it; and, as it produces misery, we must say he designed it, consequently he is not good.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

"A STRANGE THING!!"

(*Continued from page 25.*)

We think we sufficiently answered, in our last, the first thing which appeared *strange* to the writer of this little Tract: we are in this to consider his second objection. And we would have our readers expect something formidable in the objection, for the authour seems to have exerted uncommon ingenuity in its invention.

"2. If the doctrine of universal salvation was taught by the Apostles, it appears to me strange, that

their hearers were so much *alarmed* at their preaching. That the preaching of the Apostles did excite great alarm and anxiety among their hearers, is a fact with which few can be unacquainted. On the day of Pentecost, three thousand were pricked in their heart, upon the hearing of Peter's Sermon; and under the influence of their deep anxiety, they exclaimed,—'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' It seems to have been a conviction of his guilty, perishing condition, produced by the doctrine of Paul, that influenced the jailer to inquire, what he should do to be saved. When Paul stood before Felix, the Roman Governor, and 'reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgement to come, Felix *trembled*.' Now if the Apostles believed the doctrine of universal salvation, they were doubtless understood to preach it. But it appears to me *strange*, that their hearers, while hearing that all will be saved, or what evidently implied this, should *tremble*, give signs of the deepest distress, and with tears entreat the Apostles to inform them what they should do to be saved."—*Page* 2.

Perhaps there is not a more fatal errour to the right understanding of the bible than the one into which mankind, and especially the less informed, are very apt to fall, of supposing the circumstances of the audiences to which Christ and the Apostles preached, were the same, or very near the same, as are the circumstances of a common audience at this day. Measuring the Apostles by a modern clergyman, and the Jews by those who now live, our friends of the orthodox school make the bible a book of enigmas, and religion a solemn farce. Regardless of the speaker, inattentive to the persons addressed, or even the subject of discourse, they snatch at the words of Christ, and of the apostle's, and apply them with a sort of savage triumph to mankind now. The modern clergyman, who conceits himself an ambassador from God, thinks because Christ threatened the corrupt and unbelieving Jews with heavy woes even to the loss or destruction of their nation, he must threaten all who do not believe his silly jargon, nor perform his grimace, with endless misery in the world to come.

The authour of this little Tract, is at a great loss to understand what but the preaching of endless misery could have made the convulsions of the people on the day of Pentecost. Now there is no need of supposition on this subject. Happily for the world, but unfortunately for the readers of tracts, that discourse of Peter, to which our authour refers, is recorded and we can all read it for ourselves. No one, no matter how sharp-sighted, will discover the most distant allusion to endless misery. See Acts ii. 14—36.

Peter's object in this discourse was to show to the house of Israel, that God had raised up Jesus whom they had crucified, to convince them that the Jesus whom they had crucified, was the Messiah whom they had long expected. When they, the Jews, learned this, the goodness of God, and their own wickedness in putting the Saviour to death, they were pricked in the heart, as we think most any one would be at this day in their situation. We see nothing strange in the alarm they felt. They were ignorant of the way of life; they felt they had done a most heinous crime;—how should they be otherwise than alarmed? After Peter had preached to them remission of sins; after he had declared the way of life and they were baptized, they do not appear to have been alarmed. But Universalism, which by the by, our authour knows nothing about, has sufficient to alarm the sinner. Go to the murderer, go to the criminal of any kind—tell him there is no peace to the wicked—that the *way* of the transgressor is hard—that God will by no means clear the guilty, but the soul that sinneth shall die, and we think the sinner will be *alarmed*. And notwithstanding the ignorance of this writer, Universalism says all this and much more.

But endless misery folks cannot say any thing half so alarming. Suppose the Apostles had preached the doctrine of election and reprobation to these wicked Jews—told them their condition was fixed long before they were born—that those who were to be saved would be, and those who were to be damned would be; how much *alarm* would such preaching produce? Or suppose he had preached the Arminian doctrine—had said, "O house of Israel, you have committed a very bad crime—one for which you deserve to be endlessly damned; but God is very gracious, and he will not send you to hell, unless you choose to go; for if you choose to go to heaven, he will forgive not only this, but all the sins you have committed." Had he said thus, think you, kind reader, they would have been much alarmed?

The case of Felix is mentioned; and the fact that Paul's discourse made him *tremble*, is adduced as sufficient proof that Paul preached endless misery.—Does the historian of the circumstance, say that Paul preached endless misery? He does not; but what else could make Felix *tremble?* We are not required by the state of the argument to show why Felix trembled. It devolves on our opponents to show that it was the preaching of endless misery. We are informed that Paul "reasoned of righteousness, of temperance, and of a judgement to come." Three things probably to which Felix was a stranger; and the consideration that God would bring him into judgement for all his wickedness and intemperance, was doubtless what made him tremble. But let the authour of this tract show that the judgement spoken of, is a judgement in another world, or that "judgement to come," means endless misery, before he relies too implicitly upon the conclusions he has drawn.

"3. Admitting the fact that Christ and the Apostles taught the doctrine of universal salvation, it appears to me inexpressibly strange, that wicked men manifested so much *opposition* to their preaching."—*Page* 3.

We do not wonder that this should appear strange to the authour. It appears "inexpressibly strange" to the orthodox that all or nearly all the convicts in our state prisons are so bitterly opposed to Universalism as not to believe it; but all hug the salutary doctrine of endless misery.

But our composer of tracts has made a mistake.—It was not the *wicked* but the *religious* people of the age who manifested so much *opposition* to the doctrine

of Christ. The cry when he was on earth, was, "this man receiveth sinners;" "he eateth with publicans and sinners" and "the common people hear him gladly."

Who were his followers? who were Christ's persecutors? His persecutors were the *good* people—the Pharisee, the Puritan of that age; the Priest, the Levite, the Scribe, &c. All those who were so near heaven, in their own imagination, as almost to be able to reach up and take down a blessing, were his bitter opposers; and those who compassed sea and land to make one proselyte, cried out, "away with him!—crucify him! it is not fit such a fellow should live!" And we are really sorry the religious people of this age, who pattern after the Pharisees, who thank God they are not like other men—who cry to the world, "stand by, for we are more holy than you," are the ones who now oppose Universalism.

It is a remarkable fact, that none, except those who bear the character of the Scribes and Pharisees of old, now oppose Universalism; and it is equally remarkable that they do nothing more than vibrate upon our ears, the slanders which were urged against Christ and his Apostles. This is a melancholy fact, and is indeed a stumbling block to those who wish to believe that man is capable of Infinite perfectibility. For in two thousand, or nearly two thousand years, the opposers of Christ and his gospel, have not been able to invent a single new slander, but are under the necessity of repeating the old ones until they have become stale.

As it respects the opposition made to the doctrine preached by Christ and his Apostles, it doubtless proceeded from the same cause from which does the opposition now made to Universalism. It took away the high pretensions of religionists and reduced them to the same level with the rest of mankind, and it taught that those who came in at the eleventh hour, should receive their penny as well as those who had borne the heat of the day. And withal, it is very pleasing to the *pious* soul, when he is vexed with a neighbour, to tell him he shall go to hell; but this new doctrine took away his hell, and he could not console himself with the thought that his enemies would burn forever. And moreover his labour in the toilsome road of virtue, is of no use—too much!—too much!

(To be continued.)

ALBANY CHRISTIAN REGISTER.

A late number of the above named paper has the following very polite notice of the change which has lately taken place in the editorial department of the Gospel Advocate.

"*Universalism.*—The Gospel Advocate has changed editors. Mr. Everett, its former editor, has gone to enlighten the people of Massachusetts, and a Mr. Brownson has undertaken to conduct the paper. In his introductory he says the success of the Advocate 'has surpassed the most sanguine expectations of its friends; and its present circumstances are encouraging and extremely pleasing to all who are friendly to the doctrine it advocates and the course it has pursued.' There can be no question of this fact, for so long as the 'devil goeth about as a roaring lion,' the 'doctrines' of the paper will be 'extremely pleasing' to all who desire to shelter themselves from the justice of God, under the extended branches of this soul-destroying doctrine. A Universalist *revival* is the easiest thing in the world. *Faith* being out of the question, the 'minister and elders' are too liberally minded not to accommodate the *convert* with *works* upon his own terms. Press on, Mr. Brownson, in the good work, stifle conscience; there are thousands of drunkards, Sabbath breakers, and the like, who are continually putting their Maker at defiance, who need some consolation. 'Thou shalt have thy reward.'"

We acknowledge our obligations to the Editor of this really orthodox publication, though we are unable to return his civility, with that bow of politeness which characterizes the above notice. We are young as an editor, and if we should be a little deficient in editorial etiquett, we hope the enlightened and charitable editor of the Register, (a paper, which, from its contents, we should think was produced some centuries back,) will attribute it to our inexperience.

It is very charitable, and indeed may set off one's dignity to a very good advantage, to insinuate that another's doctrine or sentiments, are such as the devil inspires people to believe, and that they are "extremely pleasing to all who wish to shelter themselves from the justice of God." But we marvel, if this be the character of Universalism, that we have not long since ranked the renowned editor of the Register and the great body of the orthodox among its warmest advocates. The orthodox, we mean those who arrogate to themselves all that is correct in theory or virtuous in practice, are constantly telling how "great sinners they are," what "hard hearts" they possess, and how they "have sinned against heaven," and in their prayers they tell God, that if he had been just, or "had given them their just deserts, they should, long ere this, have been in the grave with the dead and in hell with the damned." Now, as it would be rudeness for us to accuse them of lying to God, in their prapers too; we conclude they are just as bad as they say they are, and we shall not at this time dispute that they should be damned. Now if their own doctrine does not hold out any means by which they can shelter themselves from the justice of God, and Universalism does, we marvel that they are not found among the supporters of Universalism; for they certainly do not like to be damned themselves better than other folks do, however fond they may be of damning their neighbours. But the editor of the aforesaid paper, has fallen into a trifling mistake. It is orthodoxy that men, who wish to shelter themselves from the justice of God, embrace, as more than five hundred witnesses in the state prison in this village are ready to testify; all, we have been informed, are firm believers in an angry God, a malignant devil and a burning hell—the essential articles in the creed of orthodoxy. This is easy to be seen: Universalism declares the "soul that sinneth *shall* die; but orthodoxy says "the soul that sinneth *ought* to die and be damned to all eternity; but if it will only say it is *sorry*, and think a good deal of the priest, it may go to heaven, the justice of God to the contrary notwithstanding."

Again we are told that *faith* is not necessary in a

Universalist revival. But we should like to be informed how a man can be a Universalist without having *faith*.

But this very sagacious editor has discovered that the "minister and elders are too liberally minded not to accommodate the *convert* with *works* on his own terms." It so happens the editor is right in this; for our converts, having been converted from sin to righteousness, conduct properly of their own accord, and do not need the lash of *church* discipline to drive them to their duty. We are also informed, we "shall have our reward." This is cheering, but we already have the reward of a good conscience, and the conviction, we are labouring for the good of mankind. We hope Mr. Hoffman will have his reward. But we fear if he gets no more substantial food than he gives, he will die with hunger.

SUNDAY AFFAIRS.

We recommend to the careful perusal of our readers the report of the committee to whom was referred the petition for stopping the mail and closing the post offices on the first day of the week. It is a production that does credit to the enlightened statesmen who composed the committee, and we should think it would forever silence the hypocritical cant of those, who are continually harping about the *laws* of *God*. The Report takes up the subject in its true light, and shows the danger of passing any legislative act on a petition of this nature.

Our Sunday folks care no more about the Sabbath than they do about the man in the moon; but they are extremely anxious that the civil authority should bow to their dictation. They remember to have read that princes received their crowns from the professed ministers of Jesus, and that kings condescended to kiss the great toe of his Holiness the pretended successor of St. Peter; and it would be extremely flattering to our ambitious clergy to have those golden days return. Despairing of being made kings, they are ambitious to become popes, that kings may become their waiters, and statesmen their servant boys.

Government has no right to determine what are the laws of God; and we feel proud that those we have selected to watch over our interests and to make laws to check our encroachments upon each other, are sensible of this fact, and have given proofs of their determination to abide by it. Our Government knows no religion but integrity, wisdom and publick spirit. And whenever they forget this, and become theologians, and endeavour to incorporate any religious creed, no matter how correct or innocent in itself considered, that moment our liberty is endangered, and we are at the mercy of those who bow to no tribunal but the one suited to their ambition, and to those who regard no law but such as their dreams may name the law of God. But we have said enough. The report does justice to the subject; and we think our readers will read it with interest. It will be found on another page.

CLERICAL INFLUENCE.

In looking over the Journal of our Legislature in this state, we were surprized to find a motion for adjourning, from Wednesday to Friday, that Thursday might be observed as a *fast*, in obedience to the request of the Dutch and Presbyterian Synods, who had set apart that day to *fast* for the suppression of the sin of intemperance. We were surprised at the motion, much more so, that it should carry by fifteen majority.

That the clergy of the Dutch and Presbyterian Synods should believe, that to abstain from business, will induce the Almighty to work a miracle to prevent people from drinking rum, is nothing strange. It is as consistent as the greater part of their faith. But that a house of grave legislators should be of such an opinion, is something which we cannot account for.

But there is one thing which looks to us dangerous: that is, the precedent of yielding to a *sectarian* call.—These Synods may have another request. It will no doubt come under the mask of piety or morality;—what shall be done? Comply—and—go on—complying, and farewell independence in a legislator—farewell liberty and every thing dear to the human heart.

We think there is a more effectual way to stop the progress of intemperance. Why are not the people in the south of France as intemperate as in England or as in this country? Their strongest drink is wine. Let the vine be cultivated, and let the plenty and cheapness of wine force out of use all distilled spirits, and our people will become temperate. But unless some such thing be done, preachers may give sermons, priests may pray and form societies, legislatures may fast, and hypocrites put on long faces, but intemperance will remain.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

MR. RAINS' LETTER.—NO. II.

(*Concluded from page* 27.)

You perhaps see by this time, sir, who are the pretenders to apostolick inspirations. We believe, sir, or at least I do, that miraculous inspirations, properly so called, did not survive the apostolick age; and consequently we cannot believe that miraculous baptism survived that age. In fact we cannot believe any thing only by the force of testimony either real or presumptive. And we know of no divine testimony for *Holy Spirit baptism* in our days.—To us it seems that the Divine Being was pleased on the day of Pentecost to give from heaven a miraculous attestation of the truth of the apostolick testimony in behalf of the Jews, and that to the Gentiles he gave the same attestation, when Peter preached at the house of Cornelius; and that when this attestation was given to both Jews and Gentiles, for the establishing of the kingdom of heaven among men, by enduing the apostles, and others, with miraculous powers for this purpose, there was no farther need for such miraculous interference. And furthermore, we know of no evidence by which it can be proved, that *Holy Spirit bap-*

tism was ever established by law and therefore there is no necessity that any law should be repealed in order to its discontinuance. But this cannot be said of *water baptism.* We have already proved that it was established by law, and by the great Lawgiver of Christians—by him who said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." It has been established by a law which cannot be repealed, while the heavens and the earth endure; and it is by virtue of this law, that baptism is of universal obligation among all disciples of Jesus. This law requires no miraculous power or gift, in either administrator or subject. According to the law of Christ, the subject of this baptism must "believe that Jesus is the Son of God:" Acts viii. 37. And according to the law, of the same Lawgiver, who gave a law by his spirit through the medium of the apostle Paul to Timothy, the qualifications of a bishop even in the apostolick age, included nothing miraculous. Read the qualifications of a bishop in 1st Tim. iii. 1—11. I am astonished that men should talk as you have done, on a subject like the present!—You require us to work miracles, and show you mighty signs and wonders, before you will consent to be baptized. The conduct of many men, in this respect, reminds me of the rich man in hell, who desired Abraham to send Lazarus to his five brethren to testify unto them. "They have Moses and the prophets," said Abraham, "if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." So do I say to my opponents with a small difference in phraseology. You have Jesus Christ and his apostles, and all the miracles which God wrought by them in confirmation of their testimony. Hear them, and obey them. If you will not obey the laws of Christ, from the force of the miracles wrought by Christ and his apostles, neither would you obey were I to work a miracle for you! You would just say, he is a conjurer, and thereby bring on yourselves greater condemnation!

Now, sir, since the law of Christ, in relation to baptism, has not been, and cannot be repealed, and it requires not miraculous powers, in either the subjects or administrators of baptism in order to its fulfilment, I can see no remaining rational objection to our observing this ordinance just as the primitive Christians did. Nay, we are, it seems to me, bound by every thing sacred to obey it. We have them for examples, and the law of Christ for our guide, and how can we err with such excellent guides? Were I about to constitute a church in the state of Ohio, or any where else, I would lead the minds of the people back to Pentecost; I would exhibit before them, by the divine testimony, the wonders which were performed in that memorable day. I would read to them Peter's sermon on the subject of the resurrection of Jesus. I would endeavour to present the various circumstances of that eventful period before them in such a manner that they should have proper conceptions of all of them, and be influenced by all of them. I would likewise call them to look at their own wicked hearts, in order that they might see their own sinfulness and need of salvation. I would then announce pardon, and present salvation through the name of Jesus, to as many as would obey. To every believer, who should earnestly desire to be saved, I would say, "repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." I would not set myself up to be some "great one," as we have been slanderously reported to have done; but I would endeavour to bring the people's minds to the ministry of the apostle, "that they might manifestly be declared to be the epistle of Christ, ministered by the apostles," (not us,) "written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart:" 2nd Cor. iii. 3.

We believe, sir, that all Christians "drink into one spirit," but we do not believe that *drinking* the *spirit*, signifies being *baptized* with or in spirit, any more than drinking a glass of water, signifies being baptized with or in water. All the holy prophets had received the Holy Spirit, "for they spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit;" but we are no where told that they were baptized with it.—The *Twelve* and the *Seventy* had received the Holy Spirit long before Pentecost; but still it was necessary that they should "tarry at Jerusalem," until they should be baptized with it. We therefore have no objections to tell our congregations that they may *drink* of the Holy Spirit; but at the same time we hope we shall never be so "inflated with wind," as to tell any body under our ministry, that they may be *baptized* with it, except forsooth, the age of miracles should return.

In relation to what you say concerning my "FIVE POINTS," I answer, that if "faith in Jesus Christ," and "reformation," and "baptism for the remission of sins," together with the "remission of my sins," and a participation of the "Holy Spirit," constitute me a "*sectarian*," I am willing to be one. "For if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his," "and what part hath he that believeth with an infidel." Would you, sir, fellowship a man who did not believe Jesus to be the Son of God, and who would not reform? If you would you must be very liberal!

But you called me a "*Campbellite.* Why sir, did you not call yourself a Ballouite? and why do you not call your own converts Everettites. "Happy is the man who condemneth not himself in the thing which he alloweth." This trifling and mean practice of calling

churches after the names of celebrated preachers, has tended very much to multiply sects and divisions in Christendom. "But out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Now, sir, I say unto you, call me no more a Campbellite. I am not one; and with honest indignation will spurn the little soul which shall persist in calling me by such a name after this warning.

All that you have to do, is to prove that I have taken wrong ground, and if you can convince me of this, I will publickly acknowledge you to be my benefactor; but if such should be the event, I must entreat you, to warn people not to call me after your name, as you have called me after Campbell's, for I do hate such "*littleness.*"

And now, as I must close this letter, permit me to caution you sir, not to get angry at any thing you may see in it. It perhaps would be well for you to understand some parts of it "spiritually," according to "Kneelands translation" or the "improved version." I have but little time to devote to writing, being generally engaged in travelling from place to place. Yours, respectfully,

AYLETT RAINS.

Chillicothe, Oct. 25, 1828.

A FRAGMENT.

I remember the impression. The scene now appears to my mind in all its appalling horrour. Never shall I forget it. Amelia was a lovely girl. She had the sweetest disposition and a highly cultivated mind. She was an ornament to her friends, and had the love of all who had ever seen her. So mild, so pleasant, so engaging were her manners that she seemed to soften the feelings of every one in her presence, and to infuse her own gentle spirit into the breast of every one with whom she conversed. Often, very often, has the sweet musical tones of her voice soothed my melancholy and made me forget every sorrow and affliction, (and I have had my share,) which preyed upon my heart.

She was not yet twenty: Disease—a consumption in its last stage—had confined her to the bed from which her soul was to take its flight for another world. There was no trace of her beauty left, but the smile which always played upon her lips, and the rose which dimly bloomed where the soul of beauty had once chose its residence. Her strength had failed, and her mind had lost its vigour and seemed just extinguished. Her friends—all were such—were weeping around. Her sister—she had but one—was overpowered with the thought that she should lose the sister of her love.

I strove to comfort them—I was weeping myself. But she, the one ready to depart, was calm, resigned. No fears disturbed her repose—no cloud came over her mind to hide it from her Saviour's love. Yet she was affected, but it was the grief of her friends which affected her. She was willing to die, but she would have lived for their happiness.

The man of God, the meek disciple of the compassionate Redeemer, whose duty it is to comfort those who mourn, to smooth the bed of death, and give consolation to those who weep to think what they are about to lose—the clergyman came in. His countenance was sad: no wonder, so it was with the rest. His bosom heaved a sigh—all sighed. He came to the dying girl; he very kindly took her hand—felt for her pulse—it was nearly gone. "You are dying, Amelia," he said, "you are dying. You have but a few moments to live—have you made your peace with God? have you an interest in the Saviour?"

"I think I have," she said. "I believe my Heavenly Father has always been good to me, and I do not feel to distrust him now."

"But," continued the comforter, "have you repented of your sins? have you been born again? do you feel that you have been converted to God?"

She replied, "Jesus died to save me."

"But you are a sinner—do you not know you are a sinner?" he said, "and that unless you have made your peace with God, you will be eternally miserable. God has commanded you to repent; he has told you except you be born again, you *cannot* see his kingdom. Do you not fear you will go to hell?"

Her soul struggled—she could scarcely reply: "Sir, I have ever attempted to do my duty; if I have injured any one, they must forgive. I believe God will, and I trust myself in his arms."

Silence reigned for a few moments, but I perceived our man of God was not satisfied. He looked upon the almost lifeless clay of the once lovely girl.—She was calm; the spirit was already stretching its pinions for the other world. But it must not part in peace.

"You are not afraid to die, then?" he said and his lip seemed to quiver with rage. "And you are willing to die too, in this awful stupidity and hardness of heart! You will die alienated from God—at war with his grace—unconverted to his love—unregenerated by his spirit—and drop into hell? Poor girl! you are lost! I would pray, but it is useless. You *are* lost—O think there is"—a day of judgement, he would have said—but her spirit was gone. Amelia was no more. She would have wept at his barbarity but weeping with her was over.

It was the priest of the parish. The surviving sister was a member of his church. She had been accustomed to believe whatever he said. Those who have felt what she felt may appreciate her distress. I cannot tell it. Nor indeed what were the feelings of the afflicted parents, who were also members of his church.

The funeral came—I did not attend. I

could not bear the consolation the preacher was likely to give. But he told the audience that Amelia had gone to hell, for she had never been converted and she died awfully stupid. And concluded by telling the relations, the father, the mother, and the sister, it was their duty to be reconciled to the justice of God, for it would be for his glory that all impenitent sinners should be eternally damned. SENEX.

SUFFERING FOR CHRIST'S SAKE.

There is a pride, very pleasing to the human heart, in the consciousness or rather persuasion which some feel, in believing that their sufferings, their afflictions and difficulties, in the world, are owing to their zeal and perseverance in the cause of Christ or of religion. A man rises in his own estimation the moment he flatters himself that he has parted with some much-loved enjoyment, that he has made sacrifices to support virtue, and has endured much to advance the prosperity of religion.—Whenever a man can flatter himself that his sufferings are occasioned by his piety, by his adherence to the laws of God and his strict compliance with the stern demands of duty, he feels a self complacency that, not only leads him to submit without a murmur, but actually induces him to court misery as the best means of satisfying his conscience and of exhibiting his superiour worth and virtue to others.

Had not experience developed this principle as one on which we often act, we should be unable to account for the patient self-denial of monks and anchorites, and also for the penance they so often perform and the wretchedness they so often compel themselves to endure.

My friend Theosophos, is a man of good natural parts, but an erroneous education has so obscured his mental vision and distorted his intellectual powers, that he can scarcely make any one believe it. He was designed for the ministry of the Church; but his father dying insolvent before he had completed his studies, he was prevented from making the necessary preparations. He however had the seeds of piety implanted and he is now one of the most religious men with whom I am acquainted.

Theosophos has tried a number of professions and pursuits, but has uniformly failed in them all; and his whole life seems to have been one unbroken chain of misfortunes and painful adversity. He is now suffering all the rage of the most abject penury; his wife and children suffer for bread which he cannot procure, and he himself is frequently compelled to satisfy his hunger with faith. But converse with him, and if he complains, it is because he has not had to pass through greater afflictions for his Divine Master. And if you mark him closely, you will not unfrequently see him inflicting some pain upon himself or submitting to some severe mortification, that he may be more worthy the compassion of the Saviour, and feel conscious that he has suffered more for the cause of religion.

It is very customary for Theosophos to visit those whose sentiments are entirely opposed to his own, and to commence a rude attack upon their faith, to accuse them in the severest manner, of heresy, to threaten them with eternal damnation, to use such language, to advocate and exemplify such practices as he knows are extremely offensive, until he arouses their indignation, and provokes them to abuse him, and perhaps turn him out of doors, if they do not use violence to his person. He returns thanking God and singing hallelujah that he has been accounted worthy to suffer for Christ's sake.

I recollect one evening when I was travelling, I put up at a publick house and was about to retire, when who should be ushered into my room but Theosphos? His tall spare figure, now reduced by long abstinence to almost a skeleton, made me, at first, conclude that his majesty the "King of terrours" had appeared *in propria persona;* but the next look recognized my old friend, who it appeared was out on a sort of *missionary* voyage. He immediately commenced a religious conversation, and in the voice of Stentor, warned me to repent, for the day of judgement was at hand. Not having any suit to bring against any one on that day, and not apprehensive that any one would bring a suit against me, I only smiled. His zeal was kindled; he must convert me, or not only I, but himself also would be lost. To prayer he went, with his coat off, ready prepared to scale the battlements of heaven. But his manner was so uncouth and his prayer so long, and so loud, and so indecent withall, that the landlord was compelled to stop him, after he had bellowed for about one hour and a half, or submit to the mortification of having his travellers leave his house. Theosophos stopped his prayer, but soon as he reached the street his voice was raised in praise to God, that he was worthy to suffer persecution. Theosophos was not miserable; he felt happy, because he felt himself the favourite of God, and what he suffered was the natural consequence which every man must expect who will faithfully discharge his duty.

NEMO.

IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

JANUARY 19, 1829.

Mr. Johnson, of Ky. made the following Report:

The Committee to whom was referred the several petitions on the subject of mails on the Sabbath, or first day of the week,

REPORT:

That some respite is required from the ordinary vocations of life, is an established prin-

ciple, sanctioned by the usages of all nations, whether Christian or Pagan. One day in seven has also been determined upon as the proportion of time; and in conformity with the wishes of a great majority of citizens of this country, the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, has been set apart to that object. The principle has received the sanction of the national legislature, so far as to admit a suspension of all publick business on that day, except in cases of absolute necessity, or of great publick utility. This principle, the committee would not wish to disturb. If kept within its legitimate sphere of action, no injury can result from its observance. It should, however, be kept in mind, that the proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious, as well as civil rights; and not to determine for any, whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy.

We are aware, that a variety of sentiment exists among the good citizens of this nation, on the subject of the Sabbath day; and our government is designed for the protection of one, as much as for another. The Jews, who, in this country are as free as Christians, are entitled to the same protection from the laws, derive their obligation to keep the Sabbath day from the fourth commandment of their decalogue, and in conformity with that injunction, pay religious homage to the seventh day of the week, which we call Saturday. One denomination of Christians among us, justly celebrated for their piety, and certainly as good citizens as any other class, agree with the Jews in the moral obligation of the Sabbath, and observe the same day. There are also many Christians among us, who derive not their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the decalogues, but regard the Jewish Sabbath as abrogated. From the example of the Apostles of Christ, they have chosen the first day of the week, instead of that day set apart in the decalogue, for their religious devotions. These have generally regarded the observance of the day as a devotional exercise, and would not more readily enforce it upon others, than they would enforce secret prayer or devout meditations. Urging the fact, that neither their Lord nor his disciples, though often censured by their accusers for a violation of the Sabbath, ever enjoined its observance, they regard it as a subject on which every person should be fully persuaded in his own mind, and not coerce others to act upon his persuasion. Many Christians again differ from these, professing to derive their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the fourth commandment of the Jewish decalogue, and bring the example of the Apostles, who appear to have held their publick meetings for worship on the first day of the week, as authority for so far changing the decalogue, as to substitute that day for the seventh. The Jewish government was a theocracy, which enforced religious observances; and though the committee would hope that no portion of the citizens of our country could willingly introduce a system of religious coercion in our civil institutions, the example of other nations should admonish us to watch carefully against its earliest indication.

With these different religious views, the committee are of opinion that Congress cannot interfere. It is not the legitimate province of the legislature to determine what religion is true, or what false. Our government is a civil, and not a religious institution. Our Constitution recognises in every person, the right to choose his own religion, and to enjoy it freely, without molestation. Whatever may be the religious sentiments of citizens and however variant, they are alike entitled to protection from the government, so long as they do not invade the rights of others.

The transportation of the mail on the first day of the week, it is believed, does not interfere with the rights of conscience. The petitioners for its discontinuance appear to be actuated from a religious zeal, which may be commendable if confined to its proper sphere; but they assume a position better suited to an ecclesiastical than to a civil institution. They appear, in many instances, to lay it down as an axiom, that the practice is a violation of the law of God. Should Congress, in their legislative capacity, adopt the sentiment, it would establish the principle, that the Legislature is a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. It would involve a legislative decision in a religious controversy; and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society, or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced, it will be impossible to define its bounds. Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered, but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has wisely withheld from our government the power of defining the Divine Law. It is a right reserved to each citizen; and while he respects the equal rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions.

Extensive religious combinations, to effect a political object, are in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. This first effort of the kind, calls for the establishment of a principle, which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. If admitted, it may be justly apprehended, that the future measures of government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despo-

tism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence.

Under the present regulations of the Post Office Department, the rights of conscience are not invaded. Every agent enters voluntarily, and it is presumed conscientiously, into the discharge of his duties, without intermeddling with the conscience of another. Post offices are so regulated, as that but a small proportion of the first day of the week is required to be occupied in official busines. In the transportation of the mail on that day, no one agent is employed many hours. Religious persons enter into their business without violating their own consciences, or imposing any restraints upon others. Passengers in the mail stages are free to rest during the first day of the week, or to pursue their journeys at their own pleasure.—While the mail is transported on Saturday, the Jew and the Sabbatarian may abstain from any agency in carrying it, from conscientious scruples. While it is transported on the first day of the week, another class may abstain, from the same religious scruples. The obligation of government is the same to both of these classes; and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other, unless it should be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority.

It is the opinion of the committee that the subject should be regarded simply as a question of expediency, irrespective of its religious bearing. In this light, it has hitherto been considered. Congress have never legislated upon the subject. It rests, as it ever has done, in the legal discretion of the Postmaster General, under the repeated refusals of Congress to discontinue the Sabbath mails. His knowledge and judgement in all the concerns of that department, will not be questioned. His intense labours and assiduity have resulted in the highest improvement of every branch of his department. It is practised only on the great leading mail routes, and such others as are necessary to maintain their connexions. To prevent this, would, in the opinion of the committee, be productive of immense injury, both in its commercial, political, and in its moral bearings.

The various departments of government require, frequently in peace, always in war, the speediest intercourse with the remotest parts of the country; and one important object of the mail establishment is, to furnish the greatest and most economical facilities for such intercourse. The delay of the mails one whole day in seven, would require the employment of special expresses, at great expense, and sometimes with great uncertainty.

The commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests of our country are so intimately connected, as to require a constant and the most expeditious correspondence betwixt all our sea-ports, and betwixt them and the most interior settlements. The delay of the mails during the Sunday, would give occasion to the employment of private expresses, to such an amount, that probably ten riders would be employed where one mail stage is now running on that day; thus diverting the revenue of that department into another channel, and sinking the establishment into a state of pusillanimity incompatible with the dignity of the government of which it is a department.

Passengers in the mail stages, if the mails are not permitted to proceed on Sunday, will be expected to spend that day at a tavern upon the road, generally under circumstances not friendly to devotion, and at an expense which many are but poorly able to encounter. To obviate these difficulties, many will employ extra carriages for their conveyance, and become the bearers of correspondence, as more expeditious than the mail. The stage proprietors will themselves often furnish the travellers with those means of conveyance; so that the effect will ultimately be only to stop the mail, while the vehicle which conveys it will continue, and its passengers become the special messengers for conveying a considerable proportion of what would otherwise constitute the contents of the mail.

Nor can the committee discover where the system could consistently end. If the observance of a holyday becomes incorporated in our institutions, shall we not forbid the movement of an army; prohibit an assault in time of war; and lay an injunction upon our naval officers to lie in the wind while upon the ocean on that day? Consistency would seem to require it. Nor is it certain that we should stop here. If the principle is once established, that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum. We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for the worship of the Creator, and for the support of Christian ministers, if we believe such measures will promote the interests of Christianity. It is the settled conviction of the committee, that the only method of avoiding these consequences, with their attendant train of evils, is to adhere strictly to the spirit of the Constitution, which regards the general government in no other light than that of a civil institution, wholly destitute of religious authority.

What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of govermental indulgence, but as rights, of which the government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotick power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them. Let the national legislature once perform an act which involved

the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid for that usurpation of the Divine prerogative in this country, which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the old world. Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion, for enforcing religious observances. Let the professors of Christianity recommend their religion by deeds of benevolence—by Christian meekness—by lives of temperance and holiness. Let them combine their efforts to instruct the ignorant—to relieve the widow and the orphan—to promulgate to the world the gospel of their Saviour, recommending its precepts by their habitual example: government will find its legitimate object in protecting them. It cannot oppose them, and they will not need its aid. Their moral influence will then do infinitely more to advance the true interests of religion, than any measures which they may call on Congress to enact.

The petitioners do not complain of any infringement upon their own rights. They enjoy all that Christians ought to ask at the hand of any government—protection from molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments.

Resolved, That the Committee be discharged from the farther consideration of the subject.

FREE MEETINGS ADVOCATE.

Our paper is not intended as a review of new publications, and we are not much in the habit of noticing them. But we notice the one we have just named, and we do it because we fear its merits are not duly appreciated. It was not ushered into the world with noise, pomp nor ostentation, but its claims on publick patronage are threefold stronger than many which are cried to the skies.

Its design is to encourage freedom of thought and expression. It is opposed to the arrogant pretensions of the priesthood, and it labours to make every man sensible of his own rights, and, what is of equal importance, to persuade him to exercise those rights.—The editor may have some visionary notions, and the manner in which he would reduce his principles to practice, may be liable to some objections. Whether so or not, we shall not assume the province of determining. The Editor is a genuine friend to the human race; and, what we esteem him for, he is willing to make any sacrifice to maintain mental independance.

The Free Meetings Advocate is published once a month at one dollar for twelve numbers, sixteen pages octavo each. Edited and published by W. Andrews, printed by Doubleday & Allen, Auburn.

CHRISTIANITY, No, 4. and the review of Sellon's Sermons, as well as some other matter intended for this number, are delayed for the want of room.

We again return our thanks to our agents for their activity in procuring us new subscribers. One friend who was not an agent, forwarded us the names of thirteen new snbscribers. We should like it if many would "go and do likewise."

POSTAGE.

One of our agents at Riga writes us he has heard that the Post-Master in that place says our subscribers must pay four cents postage on each number of this paper. In consequence of this information the publisher enclosed a number of the Advocate to the Postmaster General, and has received the following answer. We hope Postmasters will govern themselves by it, and not suffer our subscribers to be longer imposed upon.

Genl. Post-Office Department,
22d January, 1829.

SIR: The postage of the "*Gospel Advocate*" is one cent for any distance not exceeding one hundred miles, or from the place of its publication to any other place in the same state. To any place out of the state of New York, and exceeding one hundred miles, one cent and a half.

I am, very respectfully,
Your obt. servt.
JOHN McLEAN.

U. F. DOUBLEDAY, Esq.

POETRY.

THE SPIRIT'S LAND.

The Spirit's land!—where is that land,
Of which our fathers tell?
On whose mysterious, viewless strand,
Earth's parted millions dwell!
Beyond the bright and starry sphere,
Creation's flaming space remote;
Beyond the measureless career,
The phantom flight of thought.

There, fadeless flowers their blossoms wave,
Beneath the cloudless sky;
And there the latest lingering tear
Is wiped from every eye;
And souls beneath the trees of life,
Repose upon that blessed shore,
Where pain, and toil, and storm, and strife,
Shall never reach them more.

And yet, methinks, a chastened woe
E'en there may prompt the sigh—
Sweet sorrows we would not forego
For calm unmingled joy,
When strains from angel harps may stray
On heavenly airs, of mortal birth,
That we have heard, far, far away,
Amid the bowers of earth.

Ah! then perchance, their saddening spell,
That from oblivion saves,
May wander like a lorn farewell,
From this dim land of graves;
And, like the vision of a dream,
Shed on the disembodied mind
Of mortal life a dying gleam,
And loved ones left behind.

Yes—yes, I will, I must believe,
That nature's sacred ties
Survive, and to the spirit cleave,
Immortal in the skies;
And that imperfect were my bliss
In heaven itself, and dashed with care,
If those I loved on earth should miss
The path that leadeth there.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?...MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1829. [NO. 4.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON
ON THE WORD OF GOD.

Delivered at Auburn, N. Y. on the first Sabbath in February, 1829.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

"The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat?—saith the Lord."—Jer. xxiii. 28.

The remark is often made, but not oftener than its correctness will warrant, that the characteristick features of human nature are the same in all ages and in all countries of the world; and notwithstanding a change of circumstances may make some variation, yet the most careful observer can discover no alteration of the elementary principles of man, nor of the motives which prompt his exertion.

There are so many things in the chapter before us, which bear so close a resemblance to what we now see, that were it not for the known antiquity of the book, we should think it written by a careful observer of the present. There were prophets formerly who were disturbing the repose of the people and insulting their understandings with the dreams they were constantly telling each other. There are prophets now who haunt our imaginations with the horrid visions which they received in the dark. And I have often thought that the Lord might say of the modern prophets as he did of the ancients, "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. But if they had stood in my counsel, and had caused my people to hear my word, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings.—I have heard what these prophets said, that prophesy lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. How long shall this be in the hearts of the prophets that prophesy lies? Yea they are prophets of the deceit of their own hearts; which think to cause my people to forget my name by the dreams which they tell every man his neighbour, as their fathers have forgotten my name for Baal."

Formerly these dreaming prophets were very numerous, bearing the proportion to the true, as four hundred and fifty to one, and the proportion is nearly the same now as then. Formerly these prophets lacerated themselves and inflicted various wounds upon their own flesh to recommend themselves to their gods, and to make the deluded multitude think highly of their piety; and the long faces, the dismal countenances, and heavy drawn sighs, are very good evidence, that the moderns have not forgotten the arts of the ancients.

I allude in these remarks to that numerous class of men, instructors called by themselves and those they have deceived, who are constantly relating their dreams of unknown worlds and beings, who labour to make mankind believe that the wildest dreams of the most distorted imagination, are preferable to facts, and the visions of a luxuriant but unchastened fancy, are more valuable than the acquisition of truth. This class were formerly much sought after and very liberally supported; the same may be said of them now. Their principle aim is, and always has been, to keep the people in ignorance, to stifle the flame of inquiry, to check the first dawn of genuine science, and to conceal truth by the charm of words or by the mysticism of a dogma.

They have always laboured to destroy man's self respect and that just confidence in his own powers which would prompt manly exertion. They have laboured to unnerve the intellectual man, and to paralyze every effort of philanthropy to meliorate the condition of weeping millions of the human race. Their first act was to dethrone reason, and not only to crown, but to deify implicit confidence in their dreams as the sovereign lord and god of the world, which henceforth it would be nothing short of impiety to doubt, and profanity and blasphemy to disobey. Their next act was to magnify the importance of their own office, and to make the ignorant, the deluded multitude believe their mediation absolutely necessary to avert the wrath of God, and to conciliate his affections. They taught us, and they continue to teach us, that the throne of grace is approachable only through the medium of the priest, and that any one who should dare invoke the favour of God by any other method, is a thief and a robber.

Lest some daring genius should penetrate their plans and perceive their craft, they dreamed of a day of judgement, of deep Tartarian gulphs, of lakes of sulphurous flame, of "darts to inflict immortal pains, dipped in the

blood of damned souls;" and overwhelmed the mind, made it desist from every effort to recover its freedom, by menaces of the pains and groans of hell, the place where God in his anger will hurl every spirit that dare disobey the prophet.

The effect of their arts and selfish policy, have been to render intellect feverish and sickly, the energies of the human mind imbecile and useless, the moral sense distorted and unsafe as a guide, the human race weak, foolish and wretched, blind to their own good and outrageous upon all who attempt to lighten the load they bear, or to open their eyes that they may see the tyrants who oppress them.—Man is bound, but he is taught to curse the hand that presumes to unloose his fetters; his eyes are bandaged to the perception of truth, but he will invoke the wrath of God upon him who would remove the obstructions to his vision. He loathes his slavery, but deems hell his doom, if he dare be free. He sighs for freedom, but fears that sigh a murmur against heaven. He obtains a faint glimpse of the blessings of independence, enough to excite desire for their possession, but brands, as emissary of the devil, any one who presumes to persuade him to their acquisition. He hugs the chain he loathes, grasps the wretchedness he hates, applauds the slavery to which he is doomed, obeys with the most servile obsequiousness his masters, and hurls the thunderbolts of wrath at him who insinuates he is not free, or who would rid him of his tyrants.

Such have been the effects of the dreams which the prophets have been relating to the world; such the degraded condition to which the greater part of our brethren are sunk, and such the tyranny under which we groan.—Shall we submit? shall we stifle our voices—smother our desire for freedom—fold our hands and sleep on, while destruction stalks at noonday? Shall we, through fear of offending those, who live by our toil and fatten upon the sweat of our brow, be silent and inactive?—Shall we dream on, waste our time and lose the opportunity of making earth a paradise, through the hope of something in another world which the prophets promise us for feeding them with the produce of our labour here? No—no, never while nature smiles with invitations to enjoy her bounties, or while the genius of freedom points to the temple of truth with directions to enter.

Though I think meanly of man's present condition, I think nobly of what he is capable —nobly of what he may be. Farewell to the prophets; they may dream on, but we shall hereafter treat their stories as dreams, and consider their comparative worth when weighed in the scale with truth as chaff to the wheat.

"The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream." Those prophets who dream for their own emolument and ambition, may continue to dream, may tell their dreams and labour yet longer to bind the free born spirit with the chains of superstition. They may tell the fine texture of which their dreams are composed and hurl their anathemas against those who have the word of God, or who dare proclaim it; but we shall smile at their rage and labour to destroy their power with the sword, not of steel, but of KNOWLEDGE.

From our infancy we have heard of the word of God; we have heard the prophets prophecy about it; but we have not heard what it is. We have been promised heaven as a reward for believing it, and threatened with eternal tortures if we dared disbelieve it. We have hitherto failed to ascertain the import of this word; and alas! deeply mortifying to every manly principle of our nature! the word of God, to which we have listened, was the dream of the prophet; and the will of God we were required to obey, was the will of the priest. Shall we submit to such vile imposition? Will human nature never feel itself insulted? Will the native dignity of man never feel itself degraded by the shameless tricks which are played upon it? Or shall we say human nature is toodebased to feel? and that the dignity which man should ever maintain, is exchanged for the craftiness of the priest, or lost in the pusilanimity which the prophet has endeavoured to produce?

But I do not present myself to this audience to amuse them with idle declamation or useless invective, but to instruct, at least to impart a desire for knowledge; not to occupy your attention with dreams, nor to fill your heads with profane nonsense, often misnamed the word of God; but to inquire what is the word of God, and if possible, impart to each of you a noble ambition to hear, to understand and to profit by it. What then is the word of God? Go to the school of divinity and ask the professor this question, and he will immediately begin to repeat the words, heaven, hell, belief, unbelief, depravity, incarnation, vicarious atonement, the blood of a God to wash away the sins of the world, co-eternals, co-essentials, co-substantials, lapsarians, supra-lapsarians, and a thousand more barbarous sounds without meaning, and tell you these are the word of God. Go to him who has learned to repeat bible without understanding its import, and he will tell you Christ is the word of God, or that the word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, dividing asunder the joints and marrow, and separating body and spirit. But when we have listened to these answers, what do we know? The question may still be asked, what is the word of God?

The word of God is truth; yes, the word of God is TRUTH. Truth, wherever found, in books or in Nature, in the Bible or in the Koran, in the Vedes or in the Zendavesta.—

Truth is the word of God. God is truth, truth eternal and unchangeable, the Source of whatever is, and of whatever shall be. His will is his word, and his word is that eternal voice which nature speaks through all her works, and which inspiration breathes into the heart of every man that will hear. His word is no mysterious sound, no unintelligible jargon, but it is plain, simple, adapted to the lowest capacity, yet equal to the loftiest genius and to the sublimest thought. When the Universe, with its furniture of worlds and beings, was called from chaotick night, this word was uttered, and uttered with a power that rung from one end of creation to the other, and sent its reverberations back from the throne of God. It still rings with no abatement of its force—with no diminution of its intelligibility. Is man deaf that he does not hear? Is he devoid of sense that he is not charmed with its musick? Awake, O man! to its inviting voice, and let its sweet thrilling notes sooth thy heart and banish sorrow from thy bosom.

This is the word of God—so loud that the deaf may almost hear—so plain, the fool may understand—so sweet, the stupid and the insensible must admire. Need you interpreters to explain it? Need you teachers to tell it? Need you persuasion to listen? From your infancy has it sounded in your ears, plainer and more inviting has been its voice as you increased in strength. Alas! your first lesson was to disregard it—your next, that it was false, and your last, that you must believe the dream of the prophet, the jargon of the priest, or be eternally damned.

Will you suffer one to silence the discordant sounds which have been substituted for its harmony? Will you permit the hoarse croaking of the false prophet to be displaced for the soft musick of the word of God? Or will you invoke the curse of the Almighty, to blast the audacious spirit that would faithfully preach the word of God for your instruction, for the benefit of the world? Do you deem him a child of Satan, who now stands before you to point out the errours of the prophets, and to call your attention to the word of God? I can almost penetrate your hearts, and see rising to your tongues the epithets, "Infidel," "Deist," "denier of the bible," "profane reviler of the priesthood," and "blasphemer of God." Apply the terms: I feel not the reproach they bear, and fear not the mystick charm to stifle truth there may be in those words. "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word *faithfully*.

I advert not willingly to myself, but my course is different from the generality of your instructors, and some explanation is your due. You tremble, lest in my zeal against errour I sweep away religion. Fear me not. I love religion. I would indeed brush away superstition. I would drive bigotry to the land of forgetfulness, and falsehood to oblivion; but I would preserve religion. I see her temple; I admire the eminence on which it stands. I delight to enter its spacious courts and listen to her heavenly musick. But the temple of religion is the temple of CORRECT KNOWLEDGE. Its foundation is truth; its walls acquaintance with nature; its lofty dome Improvement. The paths which lead to it, are adorned with flowers, and are of easy assent. It is my ambition to enter that temple. I may never do it. But the time will come when the human race shall enter, devoid of fear, of strife, or contention.

I have said the word of God is truth whereever found; I have said the voice of nature, the voice of inspiration is truth. Let us look more closely at this subject and ascertain, if in our power, the lessons this word inculcates.

The first lesson man should learn is himself.

> "Know then thyself, presume not God to scan:
> The proper study of mankind is man,"

is the lesson of truth as well as of poetry. But do we know ourselves? Have we not been taught to despise ourselves and think only of God? I know this lesson is in opposition to your former instructions; and I also know that it is a lesson which requires the exercise of thought—a thing you have hitherto been forbidden on pain of offending God. But the craft of our former instructors is discovered. They forbid us to think lest we might think differently from their wishes. They have prevented us from learning ourselves, lest we should despise their dictation. They have studied to make us think meanly of ourselves that we might think more of them, and taught us to distrust our own powers that we might place the more dependence on theirs. They have told us ignorance is the mother of devotion, because they knew that knowledge would make us spurn their control.

Men are not sensible of the errours of their instructors. The whole system of education is founded in fraud and falsehood. Your prophets and your priests promised to make you happy. They extolled their lessons and expatiated on their utility in harmonizing the world, have they made their promise good? have they made the world happy, or society harmonious? No. Trace the history of man from the earliest ages, what have the boasted exertions of prophets and priests done towards promoting good feeling and unanimity among the members of human society? What single vice which prevailed four thousand years ago have they abolished? War still rages; murder is still seen; fraud still lives; intemperance still continues to swallow thousands in its vortex; private enmity, scandal, slander and domestick discord still disturb our repose and sadden our hearts. What have our teachers done? They complain our natures are so

perverse they cannot aid us; that the malady with which we are afflicted is of so *deadly* a kind that they cannot cure us. Let them away then. We want them not, unless they can do us good.

"But no," they reply," we may not reform the world, but we may be instrumental in saving some precious soul from everlasting misery in the world to come; and though the benefit of our labours may not be perceived here, the elect will reap the reward of our exertions hereafter." This, then, is your boasted office to train the elect for heaven? And ye would do it by immersing them in crime? Ye were training them for heaven, ye pretended mediators between God and men, ye were training men for heaven, when ye kindled the fires of persecution—training the elect for heaven, when ye erected the Inquisition and made thousands tremble before the ghostly father, pine away in its dungeons, or burn on the Auto da Fe! Ye trained men for heaven in your crusades, when ye made Asia tremble with your legions, and depopulated Europe by the ill success of your expedition! Ye are instrumental in saving the precious souls of the elect when ye anathematize thought, degrade the word of God, and enslave the minds of his children! Go then, train the elect for the infernal regions, or for what other place you please but heaven; at least let us have "peace on earth and good will to men."

Such is what our teachers have done. When told they were useless or worse than useless to us here, they defended themselves by relating the advantage they should be to us in another world. Shall we submit to this notion? "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?" Shall we then suppose this common Father, on whose bounty we live, by whose providence we are protected and by whose power we breathe, needs a fawning priest or prophet to flatter him to be gracious? If man cannot approach the throne of God, how does the priest get there? If God needs some one to propitiate his favour and to induce him to look graciously on man, who stands between him and the priest? Is not the priest a man like the rest of us? is he not equally liable to err? Let him then descend to his proper level. His reason may be good—far as we perceive it so we will follow it, but no farther. We will not give up our reason to be guided by his, for we have yet to learn that the reason of a priest is more safe than the reason of others.

Let, then, the prophet and the priest tell you it is better for you to study their dreams than yourselves, but listen to the voice of God, of reason, of experience, KNOW YOURSELVES. Man has too long remained ignorant of his own powers; and the consequence of this ignorance, is the plenteous harvest of wretchedness which he has reaped. Let him now descend from the stars, from his rambles in the empyreal sphere, look into himself and inquire, what are his wants, what he is, and what he can be.

Man is a being of numerous wants, some are natural, but by far the largest number he now has, is artificial. Let him learn how many of these have arisen from erroneous instruction, how many from the peculiar combination of circumstances with which he is surrounded, and how many are excited by his physical, moral or mental constitution. Let him learn what are superfluous and what are necessary—let him neglect the one and inquire the best means of satisfying the other.

Let man also inquire what he is, what are the powers which are given him. Man is made a rational being and he has one distinguishing characteristick—the POWER of IMPROVEMENT. Man is not like the brute that lives, eats, and dies with no more knowledge than his predecessor. He is capable of improvement. He can remove the obstacles to his enjoyment.—He can, in some measure, by the exercise of his powers, control the elements and make the most stubborn administer to his pleasure. By this faculty of improvement he fells the forest, converts the wilderness into a fruitful field—he erects his dwelling on the fastnesses of wild beasts, and builds a city where the savage sheltered himself under a few broken branches or hid himself in a cavern. He learns to navigate the ocean and to waft the rich products of every clime to his door. By the aid of a few conventional signs he can send his thoughts to the remotest corner of the world and bring back the thoughts of others. He can penetrate matter, learn many of the changes of which it is susceptible, and make it subservient to his pleasure or convenience. Man is something capable of glorifying his Creator. Man may be—what? Let thought stretch its pinions, soar to the highest, the best, the noblest point of achievement it can reach, and man may yet soar above it. We are as yet in the infancy of the world. In our childhood we have done wonders, what may be accomplished through the thousands of generations to come cannot be imagined. The temple of science, we doubt not, will supplant the temple of dreams, and the temple of "pure religion and undefiled," will displace the temple of superstition. Nature will be studied instead of creeds, and a just knowledge of things will be preferred to acquaintance with ponderous tomes of venerated ignorance and useless dogmas of faith. The time will come, if man will learn himself, when it shall be no crime to think, when to reason will not be to blaspheme, and when to dispute the assertions of the priests, will not be to dispute the word of God. I look forward to that time with emotions too big for utterance, and in its contem-

plation feel an ambition to exert all my powers to hasten its approach.

But lastly, the next lesson inculcated by the word of God is, that we learn whatever can come under the observation of our senses.—The whole of man's knowledge is confined to the world within him and to the world without. Man should not neglect either: the first is the most important, for it makes him acquainted with himself; the second is important for not only his own happiness, but his existence depends on his knowledge of the things to which he is related. We should push our investigations into the world without us,—make ourselves acquainted with the changes of which nature is susceptible, that we may make the whole subservient to the happiness of the human race.

Our work is before us; it is with us. We have not to waste our time in learning to speak the language of the dead, or in becoming able to converse with spirits. The world is our sphere. Here we are to exert ourselves.—The world has been a scene of wretchedness beyond description. Its surface has been drenched with blood. It has been to many like the fabled regions of hell—an arena of crime; where man has studied to supplant his brother, and to heap the heaviest woes upon his neighbour. Its musick has been the orphan's wail, and the oppressed widow's plaint. Its inhabitants seem to have vied with each other, which most should shame his birth and dishonour his Creator. Society which was chosen to supply our wants—governments which were adopted to protect our rights and prevent our outrages—religion invented to reconcile us to God, to ourselves, and to each other—schools which have been established as nurseries of virtue—all, all have failed in their object, and rather perpetuated than removed the ignorance and misery of our primeval condition. And this fact is disclosed, that there is some grand defect in the institutions hitherto supported. Let every one exert himself to find what and where this defect is.—The world must be regenerated—a new order of things must be established, or the world will never rise to that point of intelligence or felicity which it seems destined some day to reach.

You may shrink from the task of examination—you may think the labour of thought too burdensome, but will you forego the pleasures of the intellectual repast? If the work be laborious, so much the more credit to him that performs it. Is it difficult? be ambitious then to surmount that difficulty. You are not averse from thought. You all of you love to think and reason. It is the noblest employment in which you can be engaged. You are averse only because you have not a clear perception of the work to be done. You have supposed you must plod through volume after volume of dry and tedious lore. I make no such requisition. I ask you to look upon the volume of nature, which is expanded before you, stored with the richest instruction. I ask you to look within and read your own hearts and exercise your own judgement.

Need you motives? Look on the world,—look on that sun: was he made to shine on so much iniquity? Look on those thousand fires kindled in the evening skies,—were they set in their order to be sentinels to so many acts of cruelty? Is the world virtuous? Is it happy? Mark yourselves; are you happy? Mark the world; is there no vice? There is one continual buzz of our brethren labouring to increase their enjoyment. Hear you not the cry iterated from every quarter, "Who will show us any good?" Look at your churches, the professed depositories of all that is good on earth, are they happy? How are they torn by intestine broils! and how their bosoms burn with *holy* anger against those who do not believe their creed! how does their rage and animosity vent itself against those who should be of the same mind! All this is right? and you have no wish to remove it? no wish to send the angel of peace to remove their contention and to molify their rage?

Look closer into society, mark the fraud which is practiced; see the wealthy pining away in embroidery; see the poor discontented with his lot, using every means honest or dishonest, which are in his power, to increase his estate, and to place him at the table with the rich; see love of power, of distinction, destroying social harmony, bearing down every thing in its way to the summit of its wishes, and say if all is right, and there is no need of exertion? no need of efforts to meliorate the condition of mankind?

Forget for one moment your village, your state, or your country is the whole world, and that your relatives and acquaintances are all that claim your regard. Remember man, wherever found, is your brother; woman, wherever seen, is your sister; and that, if we would perform our duty, we must extend our good wishes and our benefactions to the utmost limits of our ability. To do much, and to do it well, we must become acquainted with the word of God; we must have correct knowledge of ourselves, of others, and of every thing we can study to advantage.

Will you reply, that it will be offensive to God for you to acquire this knowledge? Think you the offering of ignorance is the most acceptable to God? or does he fear that by our studies we shall excel him in knowledge? Be assured you will offend by this acquisition no being but the prophet or the priest, who may fear you will know too much to be duped by him, and that you will take the management of your own affairs into your hands, and will no longer pay him for robbing you. And let it be

known you can never acquire this knowledge so long as the priests bear rule. I would wage with them an exterminating warfare. I would not cease my attacks until they were destroyed. But the weapons of my warfare should not be such as they have used against hereticks and infidels. I would destroy them upon the POINT OF KNOWLEDGE. I would annihilate their craft, by giving the world knowledge enough to discern their fraud, and their power should vanish because the people would know enough to take care of themselves.

I conclude: my remarks may appear to many of you as uninteresting; but they appear so only because you have been taught differently. Were it my object to amuse, I would wing imagination through regions of ether, and occupy my time with splendid descriptions of a fairy scene in an ideal world, where fancy might revel in the wildest luxurience. But I have a higher, a nobler object in view. I aim to instruct. I aim to induce my readers to exercise their intellectual powers, and to awaken the mind from that lethargy into which false education has sunk it, to a just sense of its high destination, and to the noble conquests it can make. I would, had I the power, erect the temple of science where has stood the altar of superstition, and make the whole world cheerful worshippers at her shrine. But I know much I have said will pass unheeded; but a cheering expectation is felt,—these sentiments will yet send joy and peace throughout the world.

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

NO. IV.

ON THE USE OF REASON.

This distinction between things above reason and things contrary to reason, though by no means new, is not sufficiently understood. Whatever relates to another world, or to a mode of existence different from what we can discover here, is above or beyond reason, it is said, and so far as relates to the fact that there is another world, or that there are beings different from any discoverable here, the remark is undoubtedly correct. But declarations made to us here respecting that world or those beings are subject to the empire of reason.—Should it be said those beings are good and yet delight in cruelty, we should not hesitate to pronounce the assertion unreasonable and false, because we know a good being does not, cannot, while he retains his goodness, delight in cruelty.

It is undoubtedly the province of the bible to give us information respecting the character of our heavenly Father, and some hints respecting our final destination, but in regard to each of these there are certain laws which even the bible must not transgress. If the bible tells me there is a God, this is a simple declaration; one which, to say the least, reason does not contradict. The authority I attach to the bible requires me to believe it.—Should the bible declare this God unchangeable, I should believe it, because I have no reason to think otherwise. But should the bible assert this same God repents or changes his resolution, I should not believe, or at least I should not believe both assertions, because I know from the natnre of things both cannot be true. It is the province of reason to determine which of these two are correct, or which we should believe. The data from which reason must decide this question is still the bible, compared with what we see in nature.

We know from experience that a man never changes his mind or alters his resolutions, unless he has some motive to induce the change or alteration. And this motive is the result of something which was not seen or duly considered at the time the resolutions were formed. But could we suppose this man to have been possessed of infinite knowledge, so that he could clearly perceive whatever contingencies might or could happen; and could we suppose him also possessed of illimitable power, so that he could prevent any thing from interfering with his plans, we should be unable to perceive it possible for him to change his purposes or alter his resolutions. If the bible then assert that God is Omnipotent and Omniscient, I must assent to the declaration that he is unchangeable; consequently the assertion that he repents, or is changeable, is unreasonable and false according to its own declarations.

The province of reason, as far as the bible is concerned, is to consider the testimony or evidence by which its authority is established; to decide how far or to what subject this authority extends, and also the reasonableness or internal consistency of the declarations which it makes. The bible asserts that God commanded the Israelites to extirpate the inhabitants of the land of Canaan. Now the man who believes the bible would be under the necessity of believing, that God actually commanded one part of his children to destroy another part, did not the same bible tell us God is love, a kind and benificent Father, who is good unto all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works. Now, we know, a being that is love cannot delight in the destruction of the objects of his love: we also know a kind father would never command one part of his family to kill another part: we must, therefore, either deny that God ever gave any such command, or give up the idea that he is love, or that he regards with affection all his works. Resort, in case like this, must be to nature; we must ask ourselves which is the more probable, that God should command one man to kill another, or that an

ambitious prince or leader should give the command, and, for the sake of giving weight to his command, should say he received it from God ?

Should I be told that the bible, as many supposes it does, declares the larger part of mankind will in another world be made miserable by their Creator, and that the Creator loves all his creatures, I should not believe both propositions; for they are absolutely in contradiction to each other. We know perfectly well what a good being will do to those he loves if he have the power; and we know God would not, unless compelled, make those he loved miserable. If, then, it should be found that scripture makes assertions thus in opposition, we can believe only one to be true. The nature of the case may indeed leave us to believe either. If I choose to believe God is good, I must believe he will make those he loves happy, if he have the power; but if I choose to believe that mankind will be made eternally miserable, I shall believe that God is either a very bad or a very weak being.

It is then the office of reason to compare this book not only with the volume of nature, but with itself; and if there appear to be erroneous or inconsistent readings, they must be corrected from the best evidence the nature of the case affords. The bible can never impose silence on reason, for it must itself submit to the supremacy of reason. Without reason, man could not derive profit from the bible; and just as little profit would he derive from it, if he had reason but refused to exercise it. I do not mean to lessen the worth of the bible nor deify reason, but to place each on its proper foundation. It is as much sacrilege to detract from the worth of reason as from the worth of the bible. Both are attributed to God, and both ought to be agreed; but if on close examination there should be found any discrepancy, the bible, not reason, should yield.

No person should consider himself under obligations to believe any thing which is unreasonable. He may believe in the existence of a God, though reason may not discover his existence; in a future state of existence, though reason does not teach it; because reason does not *contradict* them, and they may be proved by testimony. All that reason can do is to examine the witnesses and determine whether they are worthy of credit. If the character of the witnesses is good—if they have the means of knowing, and appear capable of telling what they know, reason undoubtedly assents to what they depose. But if they disagree among themselves, reason either rejects the whole or selects such items from their depositions as appear to be correct.

The bible declares there is a God. I believe this declaration, and do not consider myself at liberty to doubt it, from the dependance I place on the bible. But if I could discern any thing in nature which manifestly contradicted this declaration, I should not consider myself bound to believe it, but to reject it. In a word the bible must bend to facts and not facts to the bible, should there be a disagreement, (which by the by I by no means assert.)

Whenever, then, we wish to speak or write about another world, we are to consider the bible our guide, but we are free to inquire the consistency or inconsistency with itself, of whatever it asserts. Whenever we reason of this world the bible is to he tried, so far as the past is concerned, by experience; so far as it regards the present, by what we now see; and what may relate to the future must be left to the revolutions of time to determine, whether it be truth or falsehood.

I have been thus particular in these remarks because I am anxious the subject should be understood. Men have long worshipped the bible more than they have their Creator; and if you say one word which induces the ignorant devotee to think you do not bow at the shrine of his idolatry, you see him following with the despicable language of the man of MountEphraim "ye have taken away my gods and what more have I left?" Every man should thank the hand that takes away his idols, for he will never discover the true object of adoration while the false is in his sight.

Many read the bible as they pray or say grace; not from any benefit they expect to derive from perusing it, but because they think it a *command* or a *duty*. Whenever any one takes the bible to read, he should have clear perception of what he proposes to himself as the object of reading it. He should read for information, but he should ask himself on what subjects he requires information. Not indeed to teach him the moral virtues, for these being found in our relation to each other, and to the world of matter with which we are connected, require us to study ourselves and others, together with the world within and without us, not the bible. We need no bible to tell us we ought to be just. Common sense teaches this. The bible or nature either may tell us what justice is; but as justice, and indeed all the moral virtues, must vary in some degree with circumstances, the bible cannot, unless it specify every possible condition in which a man can be placed, give us directions. The study of nature then will probably teach us more correctly and more fully what is proper to be done than the bible, which must adapt itself to the age in which it is given, without making the necessary provisions for the ages to follow. If we wish information respecting God and a future state, we may read the bible and depend upon what it says, providing it assert no absurdity or thing inconsistent with itself or with what we know. I conclude, therefore, that the bible is no authority for an un-

reasonable doctrine, though it may be for a doctrine which is above or beyond reason.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

SUNDAY MEMORIAL.

The Rochester Observer, of the 6th, contains an article, over the signature of "Jay," animadverting on Mr. Johnson's Report published in our last, and advancing sentiments which we had not expected to see owned even by the ultra-orthodoxy of the age. We published the Report with approbation. We considered it, and we have not changed our mind, an able production, clearly pointing out the danger and unconstitutionality of the prayer of the petitioners, and we hardly expected to hear any one openly opposing it. But the orthodox seem regardless of reason, of justice, or of any thing else, except to carry their own points. What are we to conclude is the spirit of that man who can pronounce Mr. Johnson's Report, "an ingenious plea for Infidelity?" Yet "Jay" pronounces it such.

One would think, from the language of certain papers and of certain divines, that true religion is unable to support itself; and that to grant universal liberty of opinion, is to encourage infidelity. How are we to understand this, that men are prone to believe falsehood rather than truth? that if truth and errour are left free to exert their powers, that errour will gain the victory? To us it has passed into a maxim, that whenever a man asks other aid than argument or the exhibition of facts, to support his sentiments, that he is conscious they cannot be supported by argument or fact. The Report in question would lay no restraint on opinion. It would follow the letter and the spirit of the Constitution and leave every citizen of these United States free to adopt such religion as should appear to him worthy of credence. But this, according to "Jay," is "an ingenious plea for infidelity." Surely Paine, Hume, Volney nor Voltaire never offered so powerful an argument for Infidelity, as is contained in this short expression. If the religion of Christ cannot exist without a law to protect it—without a legislative act prohibiting any conduct or belief contrary to its requirements, then we would say, abandon it, and let infidelity, or something else, which would not abridge the natural rights of man, be embraced.

It is known to our readers, that a memorial to Congress, from various sections of the United States, signed by numerous petitioners, has been prepared, praying Congress to pass a law prohibiting the transportation of the Mail on the first day of the week. As the conductor of a religious paper, we should have been silent on this petition, had we not conceived the principle involved in it, one which, if sanctioned by government, would be alike dangerous to religion, to ecclesiastical and to civil liberty. We might have mistaken the character of the memorial, but "Jay" has given it one even worse than we expected.

The real difference between the Memorial and Report, is, that the one assumes us to be a Christian people, the other that we have no religious character whatever." This remark is incorrect. The Report maintains the principle that government is a civil institution; that it can institute no inquiry into the religious opinions of its citizens, neither what they *are*, nor what they should be. Consequently our government, as such, has no religious character. It can have no religious character, unless it declare some system or other must be adopted by its members, which, if the Constitution mean any thing, it has no power to do. It is not meant by this, that the members of the several branches of our government have no religion. Their religion belongs to them as citizens, but is not known in their official character. The inaccuracy of "Jay's" remark may be seen. The Report assumes our *government* to have no religious character: the Memorial, that our government is Christian, and consequently under obligations to protect or support Christianity.

Jay remarks properly enough—"the main question suggested by the Report, is, Has our government a constitutional power to favour the prayer of the Memorial?" and that to settle this question we must consider, "first, what is the power of our government in matters of religion, and then, what is the legitimate construction of the Memorial."

As it regards the power of government, Jay *says* he agrees with the Report. "All will unite in the doctrine so repeatedly asserted in the Report, viz. that the power of government is limited to the protection of its citizens in their religious rights—that it does not extend to the definition of doctrines, the arbitration of controversies, or the prescription of duties." "Let it be understood," he says again, "that upon the first point, viz. the power of government in matters of religion, there is a perfect agreement between the petitioners and the committee. They both deny its authority to frame a religion for the people. They both maintain its obligation to protect the religion which the people have framed for themselves.

Jay calculates too much upon our want of discernment, if he thinks we can discover no discrepancy between the Report and the doctrine he has ascribed to it. The Report does *not* maintain that government is under obligation "to protect the *religion* which the people have framed for themselves," but, that it is under obligation to protect the religious *rights* of its citizens. Protecting religious *rights* is one thing—protecting a *religion* is another thing, very different in principle and in its results: as different as an established religion is from one unestablished. Jay either mistook the doctrine of the Report, or he has thought a little deviation from truth, might be advantageous to the cause he has espoused.

All that government has power to do, is to protect the religious rights of the people—to prevent one man's injuring another because he adopts a different creed—to prevent any one from suffering in his civil rights or immunities because he does not adopt the creed of the majority. It is a fundamental maxim of our government that every man has a right to wor-

ship God when and where his conscience dictates.—One man is not accountable to another for his religious faith, nor indeed is he accountable to society. This is a matter between the individual and his Creator, cognizable by no tribunal but that of his God. This is one of those rights of which, under no form of government, and in no circumstances whatever, can man divest himself; and whatever government, or whatever set of men, would take it away, or usurp dominion over it, has proceeded thus far in the march of tyranny—has laid the foundation for the most odious and the most unlimited despotism.

The doctrine of Jay, that the government is under "obligation to protect the religion which the people have framed for themselves," involves the grand principle of religious freedom, and if admitted by our government, would lay the axe at the root of that tree of liberty, planted by our fathers and watered by their blood. It would fell that tree, under whose branches, for half a century we have reposed securely, and on whose fruit we have fed with gratitude to the great Father of all. The legitimate construction of the Memorial, according to Jay, is, that "it does not ask government to determine what religion we shall have, but to protect the one *which* we have." That is, we do not ask government to tell us what religion we shall have; no—*we* have decided that question already, or we have decided what *ought* to be the religion of the United States, and we only ask government to give it a legal sanction. Is any one prepared to say that government has the power to give the sanction of a law to a religious opinion? The petitioners come before Congress with the remark, that Sunday is a sacred day, a day which must be kept holy unto the Lord; for this, they alledge, is the law of God. Should Congress say it *must* be thus observed, we ask if Congress would not in this case recognize the observance of Sunday as a law of God? and if they did, how far would they be from determining, in one instance at least, what is the law of God? The petitioners say, "we believe the law of God forbids the transportation of the Mail on the first day of the week; we therefore wish you to prohibit its transportation." Congress do it—do they not then assume the province of determining what is the law of God? Suppose these same petitioners should come before Congress, say they believe the preaching of certain sentiments are forbidden by the law of God, and therefore pray a law be passed prohibiting any one from preaching them, could not Congress with as much propriety grant their prayer in the letter case as in the first? Should Congress grant their prayer in one case and not the other, would it not appear evident that they resolved themselves into a tribunal to determine which is the law of God? And should they grant both, is Jay or any other man prepared to say government has not exceeded its constitutional limits?

But what kind of protection do the petitioners ask for their religion? Do they wish it protected from the cavils of Infidels, from the attacks of hereticks, or from its desecration by those who believe it? Government says to them—and always has said to them—"Citizens, you are free to embrace what religion you please. No man has a right to molest you in your religious opinions. All that is required of you, is, that you do not molest others; that you preserve inviolate for others those rights which they are required to preserve sacred to you. Do some believe differently from you? you believe differently from them; both your opinions are sacred to each of you in the eyes of government; but you must manage the affair yourselves. Government cannot protect one party more than the other. If it aid one, it injures the other.—Government, therefore, cannot interfere." Is not this protection enough? If Infidels are free to cavil at the religion of Jay and his party, Jay and his party are just as free to cavil back. If hereticks declaim against the corruptions of the orthodox, the orthodox have the same right to declaim against hereticks, and we think it a poor compliment to truth to fear she will be beaten in fair combat with falsehood. Government does protect the religious rights of the people, but it supposes each individual has the same right, whatever may be his opinions. Is not this protection enough? What more can Jay and his party ask? Perhaps we can ascertain.

"The petitioners assume it as a common conviction of the citizens of our country, that Christianity is true including the sacred character of the first day of the week;" and this assumption Jay tells us, "forms the real constitutional basis of the memorial." Granting for the present this assumption is true, we still dény the constitutional character of the memorial. We have not the constitution before us but pledge our character for the correctness of our remark, that Congress can at no time pass any law establishing any religion, but every man shall be left free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Now granting the whole American people should be agreed in the belief of any system of religion, Congress cannot without violating the constitution pass any law making that religion the religion of the people, nor can they pass any law which has the effect to establish any part of that religion as necessary to be observed.

We would now ask if the effect of the prayer of the petitioners if granted would not require *all* the people of the United States to observe the first day of the week? And would it not be a violation of the spirit of the law they wish Congress to pass, to labour or to attend to any kind of secular business on that day?—We would ask if the observance of the sabbath is not a part of the religion of the petitioners? It is then certainly, in their apprehension at least, a religious institution. Does not a law then requiring its sacred observance establish by law, so much of the religion of the petitioners? The sabbath is a part of their religion. The sabbath is established by law. A part of their religion is then established by law. And why may not the whole be established by law as well as a part.

But if the people of the United States believe, "that christianity is true including the sacred character of the first day of the week," what need of a law to protect it? Who is there to desecrate it? Or who

is injured? No man is disabled from holding any office because he is a Christian, and no one is forbidden to observe the first day of the week as holy or to keep it as sacred as he please. If some are so conscientious that they cannot perform what government requires done on that day, they are not compelled to do it ;—and when all become so conscientious that they will neither convey the mail nor open the post-offices on that day, the mail of course will stop without any law. Government compels no one to labour on the first day of the week. Those who do, do it voluntarily, and as long as this is the case no one has a right to complain. Perhaps, however, the secret of uneasiness may be found elsewhere. There is a plan on foot to prevent any except these *conscientious* christians from holding any offices under our government; and unless the mail stops on sunday and the post-offices are closed on that day, then these *conscientious* ones can neither be mail contractors nor post-masters. To stop the mail on the first day of the week becomes therefore a necessary step to the introduction of the grand project. Perhaps another reason why these measures are on foot, why those who call themselves the majority are praying for protection from the minority, is that it is of no consequence that they are protected in the enjoyment of their own opinion for themselves, while they are compelled to see their neighbours protected in different opinions. Some men have a singular way of interpreting liberty of conscience or liberty of opinion. They say government secures to all the liberty of opinion and is bound to protect them in their opinions. "Now," say these persons, "we believe, our conscience dictates the sabbath day ought to be kept by every individual, holy unto the Lord, therefore government ought to command and compel every one to keep it holy ; and if it does not pass any law to this effect, it exposes us to the pain of seeing that which we deem holy profaned." They forget that those who differ from them have consciences as well as themselves, and that government is under as much obligation to one party as to the other.

"In matters of religion as in all other matters, our government is bound by the will of its constituents. It may not decide what are the laws of God, but it is bound, in its publick measures to regard the decisions of the nation. The petitioners have asserted and made the assertion the basis of their memorial, that the decision of the nation is in favour of the Christian Sabbath."

We object both to the doctrine and to the fact of this quotation. Government in matters of religion is bound by the constitution. They can pass no law establishing any religion. No, not even if it be the *will* of every man, woman and child in the United States. If the will of the constituents can govern in this case what was the necessity of a constitution, particularly of the article in question. Government can obey the will of their constituents in no case where that will is opposed to the constitution. Suppose it should be ascertained that it was the will of all the citizens of the United States that the President should hold his office during life, or that the Presidency should be hereditaty in the family of our present incumbent, could congress pass a law to that effect? They could not, for their power is limited by the constitution. Why then talk of the decision of the nation, when that decision cannot be regarded by congress without violating the constitution. Should it be the will of its constituents government may establish a religion by law, if Jay's doctrine be true, notwithstanding the constitution to the contrary. We are ambitious to see this sentiment stamped with the publick abhorrence; for it strikes at the very root of our government and leaves us prey to every whim that may occupy the mind of the nation.

If it be said the will of the people must govern, we grant it, but the constitution must be disregarded or altered before Congress can have the power to pass any law different from what is now constitutional. A thing which we pray may never come, at least, never to favour a particular set of divines for of all government ecclesiastical is the most liable to abuse.

But we deny the fact that the decision of the nation is in favour of the Christian Sabbath. A majority may think it ought to be observed but a large portion of that majority are opposed to having any law passed on the subject. But no matter if the majority wish it established by law, all that government can say is, "citizens those of you who wish to keep the first day of the week holy can do it." This is all that in justice any should ask. A Mohometan, should he wish to reside in this country, is as much under the protection of our laws as the Christian, and government has no more right to violate his sabbath, [which is Friday] than it has the sabbath of the Christian. The Jew is as much protected by our government as the Christian, and he no more than the Christian can be deprived of his rights of conscience by the will of a majority.—Religion is a thing that cannot be determined by a plurality of voices, it can neither be bought nor sold ; it cannot be robbed nor given away. The right to worship God is an unalienable right ; and the right to adopt the mode when it does not infringe the rights of others, is equally an unalienable right. And we hesitate not to brand him, who would divest a fellow being of these rights because he has the majority with him, a misguided zealot, or a bigot who would not refuse, when occasion should offer, to kindle the fire of persecution and even light the faggots to consume the miserable being who should not adopt his creed.

To talk of regulating a man's conscience by the will of the majority, is to revive the recollection of doctrines and times which every Christian should wish to forget. One man's conscience is as dear to him as another's; and no matter whether he be alone or have the world with him. There is no reason—no justice and no religion that can allow the consciences of the majority to govern those of the minority. Let Jay, then, cease talking about the majority and the decision of the nation. If the nation have decided we shall not publish our journal, Congress cannot sanction that decision because the Constitution declares the liberty of the Press shall be preserved; and if the nation have decided we must all profess the doctrine advanced by Jay, in the article we have examined,

Congress can pass no law upon it, for the Constitution secures freedom of opinion. We conclude with the wish, that Jay may profit by our remark, and that every one of his party will recollect, if they are the majority, they need no law in their favour; for the minority seldom oppress the majority; and if they are the minority, our government protects them from every encroachment. Let them be satisfied."—EDITOR.

NEW-YORK GOSPEL HERALD.

We have forborne to notice a paper with this title lately started in the city of New-York, and we should not do it now, did not the pretensions and conduct of the proprietor or editor or both, demand a passing remark. The following letter from an esteemed brother in the ministry will serve to explain the circumstances which require animadversion.

YORK, LIVINGSTON COUNTY, Feb. 12, 1820.

DEAR SIR:—I believe it my duty, when I see any one in danger of being injured, to inform him of the danger. It appears that there is a paper, similar to yours started in the city of New-York, edited by Br. Fisk, and offered to subscribers at one dollar per year. I cannot but suspect the design is to supplant the Gospel Advocate, as also the Gospel Preacher, a work printed in Providence, Rhode Island; as they have proposed to publish a similar work for 50 cents per year. They have sent me the first No. of the paper with proposals for subscribers, and as far as I can learn, they have taken advantage of your list of agents, by supplying them in the same manner. This kind of management appears to me as dishonourable as it is contemptible. From the circumstance of the starting of the paper at the conclusion of the sixth volume of the Advocate, and underselling it, it looks to me too much like brother trying to supplant his brother.—There can be no doubt but they may be able to go on with the work, provided they can succeed in getting from the Advocate its subscribers, in connection with the new ones it will probably obtain; for every one knows that the cheapness of such a work depends on its extensive patronage. So that I have no doubt but you could well afford to reduce the price of the Advocate, provided its patronage was increased, which, if the friends of justice and liberal sentiments wish, let them give their support to the Advocate, which has already reduced its price from $2 to $1 50.

It is known to many of our readers that T. Fisk, editor of the Gospel Herald was one of the former editors of the Gospel Advocate. Mr. Fisk while an associate editor of the Advocate travelled extensively in the western country and formed many acquaintances in the section where our paper now circulates. This may give him some advantage.

But it should also be known that Mr. Fisk sold out his share in the Gospel Advocate to Messrs. Everett and Tuttle with the understanding and pledge that he would not be engaged in another paper which might interfere with the circulation of the Advocate. Messrs. Everett and Tuttle sold the whole establishment to the present publisher with the same agreement not to be engaged in editing or publishing any other paper which might affect the interest of the present proprietor. They had the agreement of Mr. Fisk and they sold the establishment with the understanding that all who had formerly been its proprietors should not engage in a paper which should have the effect to get back any part of that which they had sold. We cannot therefore consider Mr. Fisk's engaging in the Herald, under these circumstances, any better than a breach of good faith.

But notwithstanding Mr. Fisk had given this pledge he commences a paper and commences under such circumstances that we cannot avoid suspecting him of a design to get away our patronage by underselling us. In his proposals, he states in glaring capitals FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTEEN PAGES FOR ONE DOLLAR!!! Our subscribers seeing this, before they have seen his paper or known the *size* of his paper, might think we had imposed upon them. For if Br. Fisk can afford four hundred and sixteen pages for one dollar, the publisher of the Advocate must be unreasonable to demand one dollar fifty cents for the same number. But though the Herald has the appearance of being the cheapest, is, according to the quantity of matter it contains actually higher than the Advocate. One number of the Herald contains by measurement something less than three fifths the quantity of matter which is contained in the same number of pages in the Advocate. Hence the price of Mr. Fisk's paper should be only about 87 1-2 cents, to be as cheap as the Advocate, but he charges one dollar, consequently he charges nearly one eighth more for the same quantity of matter than we do. It is the publisher of the Herald that is guilty of imposition on the publick if there be any imposition.

But this is not all. With the first number, containing a good sermon indeed, but the rest half made up of promises, self-puffing and counting cents, he sends his paper, as far as we can learn, to all our agents. Many of our agents reading his promises, looking at the respectable names he *said* he should have for correspondents, (though by the by they have not written much for him yet) and reading his particular recommendations of the *cheapness* of his work, might be induced to patronize it rather than ours which should come higher. But after we have at great expense established our agencies, and published a list of agents for the benefit of our patrons, we can but think it ungenerous and dishonourable not to say unjust and unchristian for another publisher to take advantage of it to crowd his paper into notice. The publisher of the Advocate has never so far debased himself as to be guilty of such ungenerous and unfair means to increase the circulation of his paper, and while he has any sense of what is due from one man to another he never will.

The proprietor of the Herald, however, is not the only one implicated in this charge.—The publisher of the Trumpet and Magazine,

at Boston, has resorted to the same underhanded measures. His paper, as far as our information extends, has been sent to all our agents with a request for them to aid its circulation. We would ask these gentlemen, providing they should publish a list of their agents, if they would consider our course honourable, if we should send our paper to all their agents with the request that they use their influence and exertion to circulate it? Have these gentlemen ever read an old fashioned book which says, "whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even the same unto them?"

We notice another thing in the proprietor, or editor or both, of the Herald, which we highly disapprove, not because it affects our interest, but because it seems contrary to that fair and honourable dealing which *Christians*, to say the least, ought always to observe. Mr Green, of Providence, R. I. is publishing the Gospel Preacher, a periodical of original sermons from Universalist ministers. The paper has been well conducted and has been afforded at a low price, and with the pledge that the price shall be reduced whenever its patronage will warrant The publisher presented it at a low rate that our friends might be able to procure it for gratuitous distribution. Mr. Fisk issues another on the same plan at a low price, and for what? but to monopolize the publishing business by telling the publick, "Mr. Green has imposed upon you, I will furnish you with sermons at a reduced price"—which he probably may do of *such* sermons as he publishes in the Herald, (three of them may make one short one) or by procuring some like one in the third number of the Herald, which has gone the rounds till almost every boy has it by heart.

Again; we do not understand the notice that assures us the editor of the Herald has engaged the services of Mr. Russel Canfield, former editor of the Religious Inquirer. Mr. Canfield sold out his share of the Inquirer at a high price, and now publishes a notice that he is engaged to write for the Herald and wishes all his former subscribers to patronize said paper. Is this just to those to whom he sold the Inquirer? What is the Inquirer good for without subscribers? and does Mr. Canfield think it honourable to attempt to get back that good will of the publick which he has sold? If he does, we hope a discerning publick will give him merited rebuke

Mr. Canfield has also published a prospectus for another paper, of a similar character, which he says shall surpass in neatness, and in *cheapness* no doubt, any publication of the kind in America. But how is this? Is Mr. Canfield to write for the Herald, is he to request his former subscribers to patronize that paper, and then to publish a separate paper? We should suppose one paper enough for one man to conduct. Are we to consider Mr. Fisk sincere, when he tells us Mr. Canfield is engaged for the Herald? For how long time is he engaged? Perhaps, however, the proposed new paper is to be like some of Mr. Fisk's proposals, a bait to catch subscribers; and this new paper while in embryo will be amalgamated with the Herald, and its subscribers will be transferred to that paper. Mr. Fisk's exertions, his recommendation of what this paper is to be, looks too much like some such thing.

But we have only a word more to say; it is the intention of the publisher, that the Gospel Advocate shall be as cheap, according to the quantity of matter, as any other publication in the connection. Its price has already been reduced from $2,00 to $1,50, and whenever its patronage will warrant it shall be still further reduced.

Of the Herald, as to its merits, we have little to say. Br. Fisk doubtless has abilities, but it would be improper to judge them before they are developed. We remember his controversy with "Phebe," while he had charge of the Advocate, and we have been somewhat puzzled to make our ideas of a sermon correspond to the three little articles in his second number dignified with that appellation. But enough. Whenever the editor will be willing to let the merits of the Herald rest upon its own intrinsick worth, and shall evince a disposition to use honourable means, and only such, to gain it notice, he may find us ready to reciprocate all the good feeling or wishes he may express.

We cheerfully insert the following communication from our friends at the West. The rays of the sun of righteousness are not confined to the East, but will soon, we trust, irradiate the whole earth. We say to this new society we approve their resolution and they may be assured of our prayers and our best wishes for their prosperity. We have only to say in reference to the "articles of Faith" they have adopted, they should consider them as expressive of their *present* belief, rather of what *must* be their future convictions. That is, they are to consider themselves progressive beings—inquirers after truth, ready and willing to avail themselves of any discoveries they may hereafter make. ED.

To the Editor of the Gospel Advocate.

VERY DEAR SIR—

For the purpose of cheering the hearts of all friends to the spread of unadulterated truth throughout the vast heritage of our heavenly Father, we wish you to make it known through your valuable and widely circulated paper, that light hath sprung up also in the Michigan. We can number some forty believers in the faith of Abraham, in the town of Bloomfield alone We proceeded on the 11th ult. to organize a society, which was done decently and in order. Before we opened the society meeting, the throne of Grace was addressed by a Brother, and a hymn sung. A sermon was then read, which treats of the importance of "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is,"

which was both refreshing and gratifying to us all. We then proceeded to elect our officers and pass the following resolutions:

First. This society shall be denominated the first Universalist society of Bloomfield, Oakland county, Michigan. Our articles of faith were deemed too lengthy to insert in the Advocate, as taking up more room than perhaps ought to be spared, where more valuable matter might be occupied: but for a similitude, see Rochester Magazine, p. 48. The meeting further resolved, that we, as believers in the unchangeable love of God, who is good unto all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works, will endeavour to the utmost of our ability to preserve good order in society, by meeting together on the christian Sabbath, giving attendance to reading, to exhortation and to doctrine. That we will hold our meetings free for any one to make what observations they may see fit: Farther, that we, for the want of a ministering brother, will read such sermons in our possession as are calculated to edify our minds, and as shall compel such of our enemies as shall hear them, to acknowledge that we hold not the truth in unrighteousness, and that we will endeavour to walk worthy of our calling. O, our God, grant that we may press forward to the prize of the high calling of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We trust that a blow was given to proselyting in a certain *Methodistical form* at camp-meetings, last season as will not be soon healed. We are informed by some of their own disciples that they did not make one solitary proselyte; and what redounds most to the honour of those who were engaged in staying the works of darkness, is, that there was no complaint against them for disturbing the meeting. The presiding elder declared that he had never presided at a camp-meeting where there was so little disturbance made by the world's people. The people seemed to listen with profound attention to the debates which took place on the camp ground. And although their regulation for the time being, utterly forbid all disputations, yet the law-makers, were the first law-breakers; while they shortly found that they had not counted the cost. Such are the prospects in this part of our Master's vineyard. We would solicit the prayers of our distant brethren, and all the friends of that truth which freeth from spiritual bondage;—and to conclude, may we be speedily enabled to lengthen our cords and strengthen our stakes. May God bless all our endeavours to the building up of his Zion.

Yours Respectfully,
JOHN R. ROBINSON, *Sec'ry.*

P. Patrick,
Leman Case,
Ebenezer Raynale, } *Standing Committee.*

MR. MADISON,

On Religious Freedom and Rights of Conscience.

In 1784, a bill was before the House of Delegates of Virginia for a publick Act, "establishing a provision for the teachers of the Christian religion," which had for its object the compelling of every person to contribute to some religious teacher. The bill was postponed to the next session of the legislature and ordered to be printed, and the people were requested to signify their opinion respecting its adoption.

Among the numerous remonstrances against the passage of this bill, the following one drawn by Mr. Madison, stands pre-eminent. It is certainly one of the ablest productions of that great statesman, and deserves to be widely circulated. To use the language of the authour of the work from which it is extracted—Benedict's "General History of the Baptist denomination in America,"—its "style is elegant and perspicuous and for strength of reasoning and purity of principle, it has seldom been equalled, certainly never surpassed, by any thing on the subject in the English language." It is hardly necessary to say that the bill never passed the House.—*Hartford Times.*

A MEMORIAL AND REMONSTRANCE.

Drawn by James Madison, late President of the United States, in 1785.

To the Honorable the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

WE the subscribers, citizens of the Commonwealth, having taken into consideration a bill printed by order of the last session of General Assembly, entitled, "A bill for establishing a provision for teachers of the Christian Religion;" and conceiving, that the same, if finally armed with the sanction of a law will be a dangerous abuse of power; are bound, as faithful members of a free State to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which they are determined. We remonstrate against the said bill,

Because we hold it for a fundamental and unalienable truth, "that religion, or the duty which we owe to the Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The religion, then, of every man, must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is, in its nature, an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men depending on the evidence contemplated by their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men. It is unalienable also, because what is here a right towards man, it is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent both in order and time, and in de-

gree of obligation to the claims of civil society. Before any man can be considered as a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the Universe. And if a member of civil society, who enters into any subordinate association, must always do it with a reservation of his duty to general authority; much more must every the man, who becomes a member of any particular civil society, do it with a saving of his allegiance to the Universal Sovereign. We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society; and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance.—True it is, that no other rule exists, by which any question, which may divide society can be ultimately determined, but by the will of a majority; but it is also true, that the majority may trespass on the rights of the minority.

Because if religion be exempt from the authority of the Society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body. The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited. It is limited with regard to the co-ordinate departments; more necessarily, it is limited with regard to the constituents. The preservation of a free government requires, not merely that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power, be invariably maintained; but more especially, that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers, who are guilty of such an encroachment, exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are tyrants. The people who submit to it, are governed by laws made neither by themselves, nor any authority derived from them, and are slaves.

Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens and one of the noblest characteristics of the late revolution. The freemen of America did not wait until usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much, soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority, which can establish Christianity in exclusion of all other sects; that the same authority, which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property, for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment, in all cases whatsoever.

Because the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law; and which is more indispensable, in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. "If all men are, by nature, equally free and independent," all men are to be considered as entering into society on equal conditions, as relinquishing no more, and therefore, retaining no less, one than another, of their natural rights; above all, are they to be considered as retaining an "*equal* title to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience." Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess, and observe the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to those, whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom be abused, it is an offence against God, not against man. To God, therefore, and not to man, must an account of it be rendered.

As the bill violates equality, by subjecting some to peculiar burdens; so it violates the same principle, by granting to others peculiar exemptions. Are the Quakers and Menonists the only sects who think a compulsive support of their religions unnecessary and unwarrantable? Can their piety alone be entrusted with the care of publick worship? Ought their religions to be endowed, above all others, with extraordinary privileges, by which proselytes may be enticed from all others? We think too favourably of the justice and good sense of these denominations, to believe that they either covet pre-eminences over their fellow-citizens, or that they will be seduced by them from the common opposition to the measure.

Because the bill implies, either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths, or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension, falsified by the extraordinary opinions of rulers, in all ages, and throughout the world; the second, an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

Because the establishment proposed by the bill, is not requisite for the support of the Christian religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian religion itself; for every page of it disavows a dependence on the power of this world; it is a contradiction to fact, for it is known that this religion both existed and flourished, not only without the support of human laws, but in spite of every opposition from them; and not only during the period of miraculous aid, but long after it had been left to its own evidence and the ordinary care of Providence: nay, it is a contradiction in terms; for a religion not invented by human policy, must have pre-existed and been supported, before it was established by human policy: it is, moreover, to weaken in those, who profess this religion, a pious confidence in its innate excellence, and the patronage of its Author; and to foster in those, who still reject it, a suspicion that its friends are too conscious of its fallacies, to trust to its own merits.

Because experience witnesses that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen cen-

turies has the legal establishment of christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both superstition, bigotry, and persecution. Inquire of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest lustre; those of every sect point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil policy.—Propose a restoration of this primitime state, in which its teachers depended on the voluntary rewards of their flocks, many of them predict its downfall. On which side ought their testimony to have the greatest weight, when for, or when against their interest?

Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of civil government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of civil government, only as it is a means of supporting religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If religion be not within the cognizance of civil government, how can its legal establishment be said to be necessary to civil government? What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society? In some instances, they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of civil authority; in more instances, have they been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the publick liberty, may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of religion, with the same equal hand which protects his person and property; by neither invading the equal rights of any sect nor suffering any sect to invade those of another.

Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy, which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion, promised a lustre to our country, and an accession to the number of our citizens? What a melancholy mark is the bill of sudden degeneracy? Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens, all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of legislative authority. Distant as it may be, in its present form, from the inquisition, it differs only from it in degree; the one is the first step the other the last, in the career of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer under the cruel scourge in foreign regions, must view the bill as a beacon on our coast, warning him to seek some other haven, where liberty and philanthropy in their due extent may offer a more certain repose for his troubles.

Because it will have a like tendency to banish our citizens. The allurements presented by other situations, are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration, by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy, would be the same species of folly, which has dishonoured and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

Because it will destroy that moderation and harmony, which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with religion has produced among its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the old world, by vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord, proscribing all differences in religious opinion. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy, wherever it has been tried, has been found to assuage the disease. The American theatre has exhibited proofs, that equal and complete liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If, with the salutary effects of this system under our own eyes, we begin to contract the bounds of religious freedom, we know no name that will too severely reproach our folly. At least, let warning be taken at the first fruits of the threatened innovation. The very appearance of the bill has transformed that "Christian forbearance, love and charity," which of late mutually prevailed, into animosities and jealousies, which may not soon be appeased. What mischiefs may not be dreaded, should this enemy to the publick quiet be armed with the force of law?

Because the policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. The first wish of those, who ought to enjoy this precious gift, ought to be, that it may be imparted to the whole race of mankind. Compare the number of those, who have as yet received it, with the number still remaining under the dominion of false religions, and how small is the former? Does the policy of the bill tend to lessen the disapprobation? No; it at once discourages those who are strangers to the light of truth, from coming into the regions of it; and countenances by example, the nations who continue in darkness, in shutting out those who might convey it to them. Instead of levelling, as far as possible every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the bill with an ignoble and unchristian timidity, would circumscribe it, with a wall of defence against the encroachments of errour.

Because an attempt to enforce by legal sanctions, acts, obnoxious to so great a portion of citizens, tends to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of society. If it be difficult to execute any law, which is not generally deemed necessary nor salutary, what must be the case when it is deemed invalid and dangerous? And what may be the effect of so striking an example of impotency in the government on its general authority.

Because a measure of singular magnitude and delicacy, ought not to be imposed without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens; and no satisfactory method is yet proposed, by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured. "The people of the respective counties are, indeed, requested to signify their opinion, respecting the adoption of the bill, to the next session of Assembly." But the representation must be made equal, before the voice, either of the representatives or of the counties, will be that of the people. Our hope is, that neither of the former will, after due consideration, espouse the dangerous principle of the bill. Should the event disappoint us, it will still leave us in full confidence, that a fair appeal to the latter will reverse the sentence against our liberties.

Because finally, "the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion according to the dictates of his conscience," is held by the same tenure with all our rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the "Declaration of those rights which pertain to the good people of Virginia, as the basis and foundation of government," it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather with studied emphasis.—Either then we must say that the will of the Legislature is the only measure of their authority; and that in the plenitude of this authority they may sweep away all our fundamental rights: or, that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred: either we must say, that they may control the freedom of the press; may abolish the trial by jury; may swallow up the executive and judiciary powers of the State; nay, that they may annihilate our very right of suffrage, and erect themselves into an independent and hereditary assembly; or we must say that they have no authority to enact into a law, a bill under consideration. We the subscribers say, that the General Assembly of this commonwealth have no such authority; and that no effort may be omitted on our part, against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it this Remonstrance, earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may, on the one hand, turn their councils from every act, which would affront his holy prerogative, or violate the trust committed to them, and, on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of his blessing, may redound to their own praise, and may establish more firmly the liberties, the property and the happiness of this Commonwealth."

We call the attention of our readers to the "Memorial and Remonstrance," from the pen of the venerable Madison. It should be read by every individual. Its doctrines should be the first the infant should learn to lisp. And the determination to maintain these doctrines, should be the determination of every American citizen—and indeed of the world.

The attention of our readers is also called to the article under the caption "Sunday Memorial." The subject there discussed is an important one—one which is particularly important at this approaching crisis.—Our orthodox friends are checked but not defeated. They can assume a thousand shapes. They are as subtle as they are ambitious. Friends to virtue, to liberality and to genuine religion! be at your posts.—No time now to loiter or to sleep. The storm is gathering. We may ere aware feel a shock like an earthquake.

Rev. A. H. Curtis, a preacher in our connection, is a general agent for the Advocate. He is now travelling through several counties in this state and will visit several places in Pennsylvania and perhaps west into Ohio. He is affectionately recommended to our friends wherever he may find them, as one worthy of their confidence and Christian attention.

We notice in a late number of the N. York Gospel Herald a bitter lamentation of its respected editor, that Miss Frances Wright, one of the editors of the Free Enquirer, was permitted to lecture in a meeting house belonging to the Universalists in the city of New-York. The ground of complaint when scanned, is, that Miss Wright does not believe quite enough to come up to the editor's standard of orthodoxy. This is hard; but we are sorry Br. Fisk should lay it to heart. He has been denied an orthodox house, and he tho't it vastly illiberal, that he should be denied. What would it be to deny a house to Miss Wright? Being illiberal to keep countenance with those who call us hereticks. Perhaps the difficulty is, that Miss Wright is "a female," and the editor deems it his prerogative to exert his *manly* powers to abuse her.

We do not know what Miss Wright preached, nor do we care. We like the rule of our Saviour, "to do by others as we would they should do by us." We have been denied a house to preach our doctrine in, because we were heretical in the estimation of the proprietors and we thought it hard, and we think it equally hard to refuse those we might deem heretical. EDITOR.

The Rochester Observer of the 13th, is received, and shall receive our respectful attention in our next. We have paid it some attention in this number, and will assure the editor of the Observer he shall have no cause to complain of any neglect on our part.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance. to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1829. [NO. 5.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON ON REPENTANCE.

BY A. H. CURTIS.

"The goodness of God leadeth to repentance."—Rom. ii. 4.

Repentance does not consist merely in a sorrow for crimes committed; neither does it consist merely in a cessation to do wickedly, or in an outward abstinance from some gross crimes; but it consists in a reformation from former evil courses, and a resolution to perform that which is right. Repentance to be real, must also proceed from proper motives. These motives are, 1. A conviction of the heinousness of former evil practices; and 2. A sense of the divine goodness of God, and a heartfelt desire to be conformed to his will and the requirements of his laws.

Of repentance there are two kinds; the one may be termed legal, the other evangelical repentance.

1. Legal repentance is produced by a fear of punishment; which operates in a way of forced obedience, without producing any love to God, veneration for his character, or conformity of heart to the requirements of the Gospel. This species of repentance often exhibits itself, by disfigured countenances, downcast eyes, and all the marks of gloom, melancholy and discontent. It does not free the mind from the dread of an angry God, neither does it create a love of holiness and a dislike to sin. Hence we frequently hear professors of Christianity, and even *sometimes* preachers of the Gospel, manifest their inveterate hatred to virtue, by a pretence that the way of holiness is filled with thorns, while that of sin is strewed with flowers.

How often have we heard them exhort their hearers to forego the pleasures of sin, deny themselves the happiness which it produces, in order to escape eternal torment! With what vehemence do they dwell on the wrath of God, and his eternal displeasure against his offspring! Their scenes are laid in the bottomless pit; there they point us to the victims of Almighty vengeance weltering in liquid fire; by which they expect to frighten their hearers to repent. But that repentance which is produced by the fear of hell, profiteth nothing. It may induce people to the performance of some of the outward forms of religion; it may force an outward obedience to the requirements of the gospel; it may induce people to make long prayers, profess much love to God and great veneration for religion; but alas! the heart is the receptacle of all abomination. There is, there must be a secret hatred to God, a secret desire to sin. Hence the fact, that such people represent sin as a "sweet morsel." Do they not tell us that the path of duty while here on earth is hedged in on every side, filled with thorns and brambles—while the way of the transgressor is strewed with flowers—that it is all sunshine and peace? Yet, say they, you must forego these pleasures; you must deny yourselves; you must 'take up your cross;' suffer all these privations and sacrifices, in order to insure to yourselves eternal happiness in the future world. This, my hearers, is legal repentance; and the effects of it will last just as long as the fear which produced it continues, and no longer. Hence it is, that we see among professors of religion such a proneness to the commission of low and secret acts of wickedness. It is proverbial, and I repeat it with regret, that those who profess the most of this kind of religion, are the most difficult people to deal with. They do not serve God because they love him, but because they dread his anger. They take no pleasure in the performance of any acts of duty, because they are prompted by a fear of offending the unchangeable Jehovah, rather than a love of justice. If they deal justly with their fellow men, it is not because they respect them as brethren, but because they dread the anger of God—because they fear an endless hell.

How miserable are the victims of such a repentance! It is not the "goodness of God" that has led them to it; fear, not love, is the mainspring of all their religion.

No wonder, then, that such Christians should declaim against the doctrine of God's Impartial Goodness—no wonder they should dread the consequence of people believing in the final salvation of all men; for those who have no other stimulus to action than the fear of Almighty vengeance, may well dread the consequence of removing this only incentive to virtue, and dissuasive from vice. Hence their frequent confessions, if they believed in the ultimate happiness of all men, they would

give vent to their unholy passions by the commission of every kind of wickedness.

It was this species of repentance that induced Pharaoh to release the peculiar people of God. It was not from a sense of duty; it was not from a love to that people, or a desire to do them good, but from a fear of the threatened judgements of God. Therefore, as soon as their fears had subsided, he pursued after them, with the intent of again subjecting them to bondage. Do not many of the professors of religion of modern time manifest the same disposition? They virtually confess, that were it not for the fear of endless torture, they would be the grossest sinners. Shall we believe them? "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Is this kind of repentance good and acceptable unto "Him who cannot look upon sin, save with abhorrence?" "And seeketh such to worship him as do it in spirit and in truth?" "If ye love me keep my commandments," was the injunction of our Lord. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love."

Now it is manifest, that such repentance, as is produced by fear, or any other motive, save that of love to God and his creatures, is not that repentance which is necessary to constitute us children of God. We still remain characteristically the children of the devil; and though we may not openly do his works, yet we have a secret dislike to every thing that is good, and a continual longing after the world and its vanities. And until we receive that evangelical repentance which the gospel recognizes, we must be miserable.

2. Evangelical repentance is that which is produced by a sense of divine goodness, and the justice and equity of all the dealings of God. "The goodness of God leadeth to repentance," or reformation.

The repentance so frequently enjoined by Jesus Christ and his followers, was a reformation, or "turning from idols to serve the living God." The same injunctions are as applicable to us at the present day, as they were to them. All stand in need of repentance; all are more or less idolators, possessing attachments to worldly objects more or less strong as those objects are more or less valued by us. The object which engrosses our strongest affections becomes an idol, and diverts our attention from the more weighty matters of religion. Hence we see the necessity of repentance or reformation. Evangelical repentance is produced by a heartfelt belief in the goodness of God, and the propriety of observing all the requirements of his divine law.—This species of repentance removes all fear of punishment, enabling the sinner to repose the utmost confidence in his Creator, causing the heart to rejoice and abound with love which is the fulfilling of the law.

The fruits of evangelical repentance, are, gratitude and love to God, exemplified in a cheerful observance of all the requirements of the Gospel; diffusing a lasting influence thro' the thoughts and actions of life, regulating the feelings and temper of the heart. The subject of this repentance considers all men as brethren, being children of the same Father. He feels rejoiced that God should stand at the helm of the Universe, and is perfectly resigned to whatever dispensation of Providence he is called to endure. He deals uprightly with all men, because in so doing he enjoys the most happiness, and this happiness proceeds from the reflection of having contributed to the well-being of his fellow creatures. Perhaps he may not make so great a show of religion as those who obey through fear; for the worship which he performs is an act of the heart; he worships God in "spirit and in truth," and not through vain ceremonies and established forms. He shuns the haunts of vice, because he takes no pleasure in them. He knows that sin is the never-failing cause of misery, therefore he avoids it. He is sensible that virtue is its own reward, and that the reward consists in the acts themselves, and not in a future recompense. He does not expect to receive eternal life in payment for good offices here; for that is the "gift of God." He feels that he has received all the recompense which these good offices merit, through the consciousness of having performed his duty, and contributed to the happiness of his fellow-beings. In short, evangelical repentance is a cessation to do evil, and the performance of that which is good; not through the fear of endless torture, but from motives of love to God, and all his holy, wise and just laws.

The importance of this species of repentance is perfectly obvious. So long as we remain at enmity with God, so long we must be unhappy, let our course of conduct be what it may.

Again: As often as we deviate from the path of rectitude, repentance becomes again necessary; although it is contended by some, that once repenting is sufficient for a whole life-time. Therefore, it is frequently the case, that after a man has repented, and gone thro' with some formalities, such as praying, joining the church, &c. he sits down contented. He is born again, his heart is changed, and if hereafter he chance to fall into sin, it is all laid to the weakness of the flesh, or the temptations of the devil, and the man exonerates himself from punishment, by reason of having experienced the new birth.

3. Of the necessity of Repentance.

When we consider that all men are sinners, and in a state of enmity against God, and that without holiness no man can see the Lord, the necessity of repentance, or a complete reformation, from dead works to serve the living God, will be perfectly obvious. Repentance is ne-

cessary to our present peace. The righteous man is a happy man and useful to his fellows; and without it no man can be admitted to the joys of the heavenly world.

Repentance and the new birth, to me appear synonymous, without which, all Christians admit the impossibility of future happiness. That the new birth, so called in scripture, implies a radical change of nature, to me appears hardly possible, since our natures are such as God saw fit to make them; and he has doubtless made them as they should be, and if so, a change would make them as they should not be. But the truth is, we have corrupted ourselves. We doubtless came from the hand of our Creator, innocent, free from sin, and fit for the enjoyment of heaven. If not, what meant our Saviour, when he said, "Except ye repent and become as a little child, ye can in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven," and, "Suffer little children to come unto me, &c. for of such is the kingdom of heaven?" From these declarations of our Lord it would seem, that our nature is at first right, and such as it pleased God to make it; but we have corrupted our natures; we have made them wrong by our misconduct. Hence the change that is necessary, is a change of practice. When a man is in an errour, he is required to change his principles. Nicodemus, who was a Jew, was required to become a Christian. This, in those days, was termed a new birth, or being born again, which is synonymous with repentance or reformation; all of which implies a change—a change of belief—a change of conduct. In short, to "cease to do evil, and learn to do well." This however must proceed from the right motive; not through fear of a future hell of fire and brimstone, nor to purchase an eternal inheritance; but from that love to God which leads to repentance, reformation or good works.

A moral change must be effected before we can be meet subjects for the enjoyment of heaven and happiness. No man can be happy in sin, either here or hereafter. Sin brings its own recompense in just measure upon the sinner, and will so continue until sin is destroyed. He must be miserable just as long as he remains a sinner; but when he repents and ceases from sin, he ceases to be a sinner, and when he becomes holy he becomes happy. Herein is the necessity of repentance, for without it no man can be happy, either here or hereafter. And if there is any portion of the human family who shall never repent, it is manifest that that portion can never be saved; "for without holiness no man shall see the Lord." But that all men shall finally repent, and become the humble and devout worshippers of the true God, is proved by the most plain and positive declarations of scripture. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn to the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." "And they shall not teach every one his neighbour and every one his brother, saying know the Lord, for all shall know him from the least unto the greatest." And "at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, of things on earth, and things under the earth; and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." It is moreover declared, that Jesus Christ shall make an end of sin, destroy Satan and all his works and reconcile all men to God.

4. If all men shall become holy and happy in a future state of existence, wherein is the necessity of repentance in this?

This question is often propounded to Universalists, and betrays much weakness in the one that asks it, as well as ignorance of our sentiments. Suppose, for example, a man was assured that in twenty years hence he would come in possession of a large estate, would it be wisdom in that man to neglect the common concerns of life, go half starved and half naked, because he was sure of living in affluence twenty years hence? Because a man expects to be happy in a future state, is he justifiable in taking that course which will make him miserable during this life? We should neither consider it wisdom nor prudence, for a man to make himself miserable here, because he expects to be happy hereafter. We know that future salvation is not to be purchased by our present obedience. We know also, that virtue is its own reward. The moment the sinner ceases from sin and becomes holy, he becomes happy, and this is the only true source of happiness, either here or hereafter.

We shall be happy because we shall be holy, not because we were holy while here; for our holiness in this life, if we have any, we receive our reward as we proceed; and the same may be said in regard to the future. We shall be happy, because we are holy, and not because we have been holy. Now, if holiness will make us happy in a future world, it will also make us happy here; and if happiness is desirable hereafter, it is nevertheless desirable here. Why then should we pursue that course which will make us miserable, and despised by our neighbours in this life, because we have the assurance that in a future state we shall repent and be saved from sin.

Again: Has God given us assurance that our future existence shall be a state of holiness and complete happiness, and shall we exercise no gratitude for the glorious assurance? Shall we go and blaspheme the name of Him who is the authour of these joyful hopes of future blessedness? Or rather, shall not our hearts overflow with gratitude to God, for the great love wherewith he hath loved us?

"The goodness of God leadeth to repent-

ance ;" and he who has the assurance of the unlimited benevolence of his Creator, in preparing an eternal rest of holiness and peace, at his right hand, for his reception, will not fail to love him for his loving kindness. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared; teaching that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts we should live soberly, righteously and godly in the present world."

Now the Apostle was of opinion that the appearance of the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, would have the effect to produce repentance, and teach men to deny ungodliness and worldly desires, and live soberly, righteously and godly, even in this life, without the hope of a future recompense.—Therefore let men every where repent. Without it we must be miserable—with it we may be happy. Therefore as we desire happiness, let us seek repentance. And may God aid us in our desires for repentance, for a cessation from all iniquity and the practice of virtue.

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

NO. V.

ON INSPIRATION.

It is wisdom never to contend for more than can be maintained. When the Christian assumes a position from which the batteries of the Infidel dislodge him, he is in danger of losing the ground to which he has a just claim. He should therefore examine carefully his own strength that he may not, by the exorbitancy of his claims, provoke a severer combat than he can sustain.

The Bible is an ancient book. It contains many good things—much knowledge of the human heart, and discloses many important facts. It also, if we determine as we do in other cases, contains much that to us appears, at best, very doubtful.

This book is said to be inspired—written under the immediate influence of the Spirit of God. If this be a fact, and the Spirit of God, as we all believe, cannot dictate errour, it must be contended, that every thing in the bible, is truth and nothing but truth. But whoever will read the bible with a little attention, must admit, that it contains many things which cannot be believed by a man of common sense. It does contradict itself. It does contain doctrines subversive of the best interests of mankind and dishonourable to its reputed Authour. I speak of the whole bible including both the Old and New Testaments, and mean that passages may be found which come under this description.

There are those, who contend that every word of the Bible is given by inspiration—that every word was dictated by the Spirit of Infallible Truth. If this position be correct, there must not be a single mistake, nor a single contradiction in the whole book. But is this a fact? In Genesis, God is said to "tempt Abraham ;" and James tells us, "God tempteth no man." One or the other of these positions must be false. It is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be. Consequently impossible for God to tempt Abraham, if he tempts no man, and false to say he tempts no man, if he tempted Abraham.

The Bible says God is "unchangeable,"—that with him is "no variableness nor shadow of turning." It also says, God "repented that he made man ;" that he "repented him of the evil he thought to do and did it not." It, in the sixth precept of the decalogue, represents God as commanding the Israelites that they shall not kill ; and also represents him as commanding them to extirpate all the inhabitants of the land of Canaan—to leave none alive, lest they become corrupted with the vices of the land. The authour of the second book of Samuel, informs us that the "*Lord* moved David to number Israel and Judah." But the first book of Chronicles assures us it was *Satan* that provoked David to this wicked act. One or the other of these assertions must be false, for both cannot be true. One would scarcely suspect the authour of these contradictions to be the Spirit of God. I should think man might thus contradict himself without any supernatural aid.

It must be admitted, I think, that a man under the Spirit of God, is incapable of errour or of falling into mistakes. The Apostles, it is contended, on the day of Pentecost, received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and that they were then qualified to proclaim the Gospel. If we admit then, they were inspired, is it not singular, they should have been so ignorant as to suppose the gospel was limited to the Jews, when nearly the last instructions they received from Christ, were, that they should "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature?" But when Peter was sent for, to instruct Cornelius, he had to witness a miracle before he could be persuaded ; and he had also to relate the wonderful vision he had seen in his trance, before he could persuade the rest of the Apostles, that he had done right in preaching to the Gentiles.

John, in the last chapter of his gospel, mentions a mistake into which the brethren had fallen. Just before the ascension of Christ, Peter had asked what a certain disciple, who was leaning on Jesus' breast, should do. The answer was, "If I will that he tarry until I come what is that to thee?" "Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die ; yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die." Was not the brethren then mistaken? And if John had not corrected the mistake, might we not now be labouring under the same erroneous impression?

It is an indisputable fact, that the primitive Christians concluded or expected that the end of the world—the destruction of the material heavens and earth, would take place at the same time the Lord should come to execute vengeance on the city of Jerusalem and the nation of the Jews, that is, within the lifetime of that generation that heard Christ proclaim his gospel. And that the Apostle Paul fell into the same opinion, is easily collected from his first epistle to the Thessalonians. Nothing is better attested in the history of the Church, than that the believers, about the time Paul wrote this epistle, were exceedingly alarmed, that they neglected their business and concluded the end of the world was at hand; and from various passages scattered through the epistolary part of the New Testament, it seems evident that the Apostles urged this consideration as one motive to induce the multitude to embrace their doctrine, promising them, in case they believed, that they should be saved from the overwhelming ruin. But the alarm grew too great and Paul's second epistle to the Thessalonians was written to allay it, by assuring the Church that it should not be so soon, though still intimating the day was not far off. But the world stands; and we are now assured their alarm was groundless. Did the Spirit of God teach this belief? or was it occasioned by a misconstruction of the words of Christ?

But admitting these objections are nothing, it is proper to ask, which of the numerous translations that have been produced, all differing in some respects, shall be considered as the one which has every word inspired? Shall it be our authorized version, or some other one? Or if the translations are all allowed to be uninspired, which original manuscript shall we take? which out of the several hundred various readings shall we adopt, as the one which has every word inspired? the Samaritan? or the common Hebrew text? with the emendations proposed by Kennicot and others or the text as it stood before the collations of modern criticks? Is the text of Erasmus, of Robert Stephens, or of Griesbach, the one which has every word inspired?

The celebrated passage in 1st John v. 7, is rejected by Griesbach and many other eminent biblical criticks, because that out of one hundred and thirteen Greek manuscripts of this epistle which have been collated, only one contains this verse. Other criticks say it ought not to be rejected, because in Tuscany or some other place, it is probable that there are a great many more manuscripts which have not been collated. How do we know, then, that the Greek text, which we have, is the inspired one? Among the manuscripts already collected, there are several hundred various readings; and if there are a great many more which have not yet been collated, perhaps when they are, we shall have in some respects a new bible.

I grant the various readings, or the differences in the several manuscripts, are not very important, unless we suppose every word in the bible has a meaning, which indeed seems a necessary conclusion, if every word be inspired. But perhaps when we have collated the other manuscripts which it is supposed are still in existence, we may find some essential differences. And if we had the thousands which, it is supposed, have been destroyed, we know not but differences still more material might be discovered. The Holy Spirit seems to have been strangely neglectful of the preservation of his words. If the very words of the Bible were of sufficient importance to be inspired, it is matter of sincere regret, that we have not those precise words, or that we cannot tell whether we obtain them or not.

These considerations involve so many difficulties, that it seems wisdom to abandon the position, that every word of the bible is inspired. It is better to do it of our own accord, than it is to hold on till we are compelled to relinquish our grasp. And notwithstanding I dread as little as any one can the sophistry of Infidels, I think when they attack this position of ours, they have strong reasons to bring against us. Let this point be conceded. We do not contend, that *every word* of the bible is inspired. And this concession, in my opinion, does not injure the reputation of the bible, or in the least impair its utility. EDITOR.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

"A STRANGE THING!!"

(*Continued from page 25.*)

"4. Upon the supposition that all will be saved, there is something peculiarly strange in *the language* in which Christ and the Apostles speak of the future state of the righteous and the wicked. With the idea in his mind, that it was the design of Christ and the Apostles to teach the salvation of all men, let the reader consider for a moment a few of their expressions, and see if there is not something peculiarly *strange* in them: 'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell'—Matt. x. 28. Again, 'Fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea I say unto you fear him'—Luke xii. 5."

This is indeed *strange*, but we cannot help retorting the argument, if argument it can be called. "Upon the supposition that" any of the human family are to be endlessly miserable, "there appears something peculiarly strange in the language, in which Christ and the Apostles speak of the future state of the righteous and the wicked. With the idea in his mind that it was the design of Christ and the Apostles to teach the" endless misery of a large part of mankind, "let the reader consider a few of their expressions, and see if there is not something peculiarly *strange* in them." See the declaration of the Angel to the Shep-

herds, Luke ii. 10. "Fear not: for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." The declaration of Jesus, Matt. xi. 27—"All things are delivered unto me of my Father." John iii. 35—"The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." xvii. 2—"As thou hast given him [Jesus] power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." vi. 37—"All the Father giveth me shall come to me: and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." xii. 32—"I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." vi. 44, 45—"No man can come unto me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the Prophets, 'And they shall be all taught of God.' Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me."

See also Acts iii. 21—"Whom [Jesus] the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began." Eph. i. 8, 9, 10—"Wherein he [God] hath abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure which he had purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and in earth, even in him." Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11—"Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, [Jesus,] and hath given him a name which is above every name; that at, or in, the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

Again: 1 Tim. ii. 4, "God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth;" and iv. 10, "For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially, (or certainly then,) of them that believe. See also 1. John ii. 1, 2—"If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only but for the sins of the whole world." And once more: see Revelation v. 13—"And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, honour, glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever."

We will now remark in our turn, that for Christ and his Apostles, "to leave their expressions in the unguarded form in which they now stand, looks like a species of imprudence, directly calculated to lead honest, and sincere, and even discerning minds into" (not the gloomy belief of endless misery, but into) the belief of the final restitution of all things: "a species of imprudence which we are sure would destroy the popularity, and essentially injure the cause of any" preacher of endless misery "at the present day, and of which none of this class within my knowledge is ever guilty." This retort might seem enough for the fourth wonder of this wonderful writer, but we will treat with respect even the authour of a petty tract. The passages he has quoted shall be explained at large as we find time and room.

(To be continued.)

QUESTIONS FOR THE ROCHESTER OBSERVER.

As the really orthodox editor of the Observer has furnished a string of questions to a class to whom with a little qualification we acknowledge ourself to belong, and as we have not leisure at present to answer them in detail, we will furnish him a few by way of offset.

1. On what is the virtue of the people based, but on their intelligence?

2. What better standard of morality is there than the rule which requires us to do by others as we would they should do by us.

3. What people cropped the ears and bored the tongues of hereticks, banished Baptists, hung Quakers and witches—were they not the early settlers of New England?

4. Was there ever a people more impatient of oppression when themselves were the subjects, or more ready to oppress others than the first settlers of New England?

5. What people ever made religion more like a curse, or more exposed it to the sneers of Infidels than the first settlers of New England?

6. Where are there more slander, more defamation, more contention, more angry disputes, more hypocrites, more persons watching over the concerns of their neighbours, than in those states which since their first settlement have been most deeply imbued with *puritanical* sentiments?

7. Does not the history of the world show, that wherever or whenever the priests bear rule, the people are degraded, liberty and intelligence are destroyed, and the nation generally overthrown? Witness Rome. What country or nation, or society has ever prospered more than those which have allowed universal liberty of sentiment on all subjects whether political or religious?

8. If Congress pass a law prohibiting the transportation of the Mail on the first day of the week, will not those who are now petitioners for it, discover the law of God prohibits the preaching certain sentiments on that day, and that Congress should pass a law to that effect?

If the Editor will answer these, we will furnish him some more soon, which may come home to his feelings.

In making out our paper we had almost forgotten to return the Editor of the Albany Christian Register our compliments, for his respectful notice of the article we furnished by way of "courtesy" as an answer to a pretty little one, which he inserted in the midst of his missionary, tract, sabbath school and sabbath sanctifying lumber. And since the editor is at loss to know whether he shall accuse us of ignorance or misrepresentation, we would advise him to do neither, but to own the truth once, and confess that orthodoxy re-

quires little more of a man, than "to say he is sorry, and think a good deal of the priest," except—and it is unaccountable that we did not notice it before, except to pay the priest plenty of CASH.

The Editor has told us a fine little story—he would do well to write tracts—a fine story, the amount of which is, that, a certain man, now a Methodist preacher, was converted from Universalism by a remarkable question from one of his children. The father was amusing the children with the story of the "babes in the wood," when one asked, where did the children go? To heaven was the reply. Where did the wicked old uncle go? To heaven was the father's answer. Won't he kill the babes in the wood again?

Now, we have no tact in telling stories, but are strongly inclined to make some additions to this.—Who killed Uriah? David with the sword of the Ammonite. Did Uriah go to heaven? Doubtless, for it would be hard to murder him and send him to hell too. Did David go to heaven? Yes: for he was a man after God's own heart. Won't he kill Uriah again?

Who consented to the death of Stephen, and persecuted the Christians? Saul or Paul of Tarsus. Where did the Christians go when they died? To heaven Where did Paul go? To heaven. Won't he persecute the Christians again? Will the Editor of the Register republish the story, with our additions?

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

"*To whom shall we go?*"—ST. PETER.

This life must soon pass away; ere long our eyes must be closed on all which it inherits. And when the unwelcome summons comes, though our treasures surpass all the kings of the East, though all the gold of Ophir were ours, it could not yield us the least support in that dark and gloomy hour. Not the least gleam of hope can be derived from all that the world calls good. When the bow of death is bent—when the arrow is made ready upon the string, nothing can divert the fatal archer from his purpose.

What shall then support us through the gathering gloom which awaits us? Can riches, can honours, can friends, purchase for us the least hope of a future and happy immortality? The objects of our greatest solicitude are now insufficient. We regard them as trifles, not worthy a moment's reflection. Where, then, shall we seek relief? Where shall we find support? In whom shall we repose our trust? On whom shall we lean for support? Since the world and all it inherits are unable to produce one moment's rational enjoyment, or afford support in the gloomy hour of dissolution which awaits us, "To whom shall we go?" Our life, and every thing of a temporal nature must soon fade away. Alas, how wretched is man!—the sport of disappointment and trouble; born to toil and groan for a few years, and then sink into the tomb! Nothing of a temporal nature can lengthen out the thread of his existence, make that existence happy, or ensure to him a future one. We sink into the tomb; our bodies mingle with their native earth; and the soul—alas! who shall ensure it an immortal existence? Alas, the gloomy prospect of sinking into annihilation! of sleeping the eternal sleep of nonentity! His life is one continued series of toil and vexation; and after this short life is at an end, nothing can yield the least gleam of a hope of immortality!

This, my reader, is the awful situation of the man, whose only hope rests on temporal things. These are the gloomy prospects of the man who denies the authenticity of revelation. His most sanguine hopes are liable to disappointment. He has no assurance; he has no encouragement to anticipate happiness; for the only objects of his hope are temporal, and must pass away; and the objects of anticipation, when attained, often yield vexation and sorrow.

These are the prospects of the Infidel. If he hopes for immortality, he has no assurance that his hopes will be realized. When he looks beyond the grave, alas! his prospects are involved in uncertainty. He knows not (if peradventure his spirit is immortal) "what untried being he has to pass through."

All the evidences of a future state of existence, which human reason has suggested, amount to nothing higher than probable conjecture. The man who disbelieves the scriptures, is unable to arrive at any just conclusion in regard to the Supreme Being. He may admit the existence of an Overruling Providence, but how imperfect are his ideas of the character of that Being!

Unaided by revelation, the whole duty of man could never have been understood. We find that the wisest and best heathen moralists frankly confessed their ignorance in many points of duty. And Socrates even hoped with some apparent assurance, that the gods would sooner or later, grant the revelation so much needed. He felt the insufficiency of the world to yield support in life, and a hope of its immortality. In fine, there is nothing of a temporal nature that can ensure happiness in this life, and afford any comfortable hope of immortality beyond the grave.

How necessary to our present enjoyment as well as future prospects, is a revelation from Deity! How much to be desired is that revelation from heaven, which enlightens the mind with true wisdom—banishes superstition—promotes universal righteousness, charity and peace—comforts us in adversity, and gives prosperity its highest relish—that encourages the most transporting hopes, with the fullest assurance that they will not be disappointed—that rebukes every malevolent and every evil passion, and makes men resigned and thankful in the most adverse circumstances, and that

promotes real and unadulterated happiness, both here and hereafter—that brings life and immortality to light, and elevates the mind far above the glittering toys of this vain and fleeting world! This revelation has been granted. God has graciously condescended to reveal himself to man.

Eighteen hundred years ago, appeared in Judea, the Messenger of Peace—the Delegate of the Most High! He came, not like the heathen philosophers, proud, unfeeling and obstinate; neither like the Scribes and Pharisees, selfish, hard-hearted, and uncharitable; but as becometh the Messenger from Heaven, meek and unaffected, compassionate and benevolent. He appeared as the friend of man, the teacher of the poor—"having compassion on the ignorant and them that are out of the way." He came clothed with authority from on high! his mission was divine; in him were "the words of eternal life." Supernatural in power and wisdom, his doctrines were pure, his life was perfect. "He was an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile."—And although his first adherents were a few, poor and persecuted men, yet they became powerful instruments in disseminating the doctrines which he committed to their charge.—And although they were "persecuted from Nero to Dioclesian," yet believers were multiplied, and the knowledge of the truth extended. The protection of Heaven was on their side, and truth became triumphant over errrour.

How infinitely superiour to all other systems of religion or morality, is the Gospel of Jesus Christ! He who believes, and lives according to its dictates and requirements, ensures to himself present peace, and confidently hopes for a blessed and glorious immortality; and were the pure, uncorrupted principles of the gospel universally believed and practised,

"All crimes would cease, and ancient fraud would fail,
Returning Justice lift aloft her scale."

Contentment and resignation to the will of heaven, would be our lot in every circumstance in life. Having the assurance that an eternal state of unmingled happiness awaits us beyond the grave, how tranquil, how joyful would be our days! Anxiety, pain, or even the approach of death, could not take away our prop, or interrupt the pure streams of heavenly consolation. Though we meet with adversity; and though we are disappointed in our expectations of earthly happiness, yet there is one object, in the final participation of which we have the fullest assurance. Although we are called to consign our friends and relatives to the "narrow house," yet we regard the separation as but momentary; therefore, we "mourn not as those who have no hope." And though all our earthly treasures are taken from us—"though our friends should all fail, and foes all unite" against us, yet there is one to whom we can go, who is all-powerful to help in every time of trouble; for he hath "the words of eternal life." By him "life and immortality are brought to light." His dispensation is denominated the kingdom of heaven, differing materially from any human or earthly invention, as its sanctions relate to heavenly things; fixing our views on a future and blessed immortality, taking concern in the happiness of all men. By the Gospel of Jesus Christ, we are made acquainted with the character of our Father in Heaven; he "being the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person."

By the unlimitted forgiveness enjoined in the Gospel, we learn the unlimitted forgiveness of God. We are taught that he is a Spirit, eternal and unchangeable in being, possessing "absolute and unbounded perfection." By that gracious dispensation, we are taught the will of God concerning man, as well man's duty to God. We are taught that it is our duty to love him as the benevolent Father, Protector and Redeemer of all men; to trust in him as the God of all consolation, and confide in him as the Friend and Comforter of all who believe and obey his commandments. By the Dispensation of the Gospel, we are taught that "God is love." And the great love, wherewith he hath loved us, is manifested in the gift of his Son, to be the "propitiation for the sins of the world;" having given "himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time." In the Gospel we are taught that our heavenly Father is no respector of persons, but impartial in his gifts to all men, "having included them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." We are taught that the Gospel is a ministry of reconciliation, by which "God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses and sins." "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of time, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ; both which are in heaven and which are in earth, even in him."

By the Dispensation of the Gospel, we are taught to pray for the salvation of all men; "lifting up holy hands every where, without wrath and without doubting;" having the fullest assurance that our benevolent petitions shall be answered, from the declaration that "God our Saviour will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth."

In fine, the Gospel is "glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people:" from which we infer that it shall finally become a blessing to all, in their willing reception of, and joyful participation in it. From this view of the Dispensation of Christ, we say in the words of the enraptured Peter, "To whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life."

We rejoice in the hope set before us in the Gospel; we contemplate with gratitude the evidences of our final emancipation from the slavery of sin and misery; we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, that in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, are the "words of eternal life," and that the words of eternal death were never suffered to escape from his lips. A. H. CURTIS.

CHRISTIANITY.—NO. 4.

There are moments when the mind considers all human pursuits as vain, all earthly objects as emptiness, and all sublunary pleasures as unable to satisfy its longing appetite. Then arises a desire to ramble in some ideal world, to converse with spirits, to hold communion with God, and to feast on the celestial delicacies which the soul is capable of relishing. At such moments we wish to feel rather than to think, to communicate our feelings by sympathy than by conversation.

This state of mind is frequent and perhaps most frequent to those who affect to despise it. I have heard the sceptick; I have listened to many who, no doubt, loved the human race, have seen them labouring with every kind of logick they could master, to convince the world that death ends our hopes as well as our fears, our joys as well as our sorrows; but alas! what would they substitute for this dream of bliss, this belief, this hope of something good to which the soul may aspire?

I have dreamed—and who has not dreamed? of a bright and lovely world, far from this scene of noise and strife, where the serpent never comes, where the heavens are always clear, the sun always smiles, and the flowers ever bloom. Where no whirlwind's rage is felt, where no lightnings scathe and no thunders roar. Where the heart never sickens, the eye never looks on iniquity; where sorrow finds no admittance and lassitude is never felt. There man finds a scene suited to his tastes, a world equal to the capaciousness of his mind, and delights equal to the largeness of his desires. There trees hang with fruit and the groves are filled with musick. He need not waste his time to break the stubborn globe, nor wear out his life in toil to gain a scanty subsistance. Nature spontaneously yields what ere he desires, and he has but to wish and his wish is gratified.

Yes call it a dream, proud scepticism, if thou wilt. I have lingered on the bright vision, and felt the peace, the quietness and delight it gives. When nature seemed convulsed, the elements at war, and man destroying man, desolating the world and making earth a scene of blood and ruin, I have lingered on the bright vision, and felt my heart glow with joy and my soul filled with rapture, that one day I may enter that blisful land and see the whole race of man, in universal love, recline in its green shady bowers, ramble over its flowery lawns, listen to the soft musick which floats in the air, or feast the soul with delicacies on which angels feed and which seraph shares. O it may be a dream but it is a blissful dream. Often has that dream concealed the frowns of fate, given the soul a supernatural strength, made it pass lightly over the seas of care, anxiety and sorrow which threatened to engulph it. Often has it hushed away the gloom which hovered over me, made me forget the vexations of life, and happy in thinking what I may one day enjoy.

Scepticism! thou god of the pretended philosopher; thou art good to excite inquiry, but if I must, after all my researches, worship at thy shrine, let me remain in ignorance. If after I have followed thee through the fields of science and listened to all thy suggestions, while examining the phenomena of nature, I must still listen to thee on the brink of the tomb, and fear to clasp the hope of future life because thou art too timorous to believe, then go; I will follow my heart and receive from Faith what thou dost deny. Annihilation! Nonentity! to sleep that dreamless sleep! The eyes never to open on the works of Almighty God! the bosom never to glow with warm emotion on meeting those we love! the mother when laying her babe in the silent grave, to take an eternal farewell! the tender cords which entwine the feeling heat to be severed for ever!

"Ah me! the laurel'd wreath that murder rears,
Blood nursed and watered by the widow's tears,
Seems not so foul, so tainted and so dread,
As waves the night-shade round the sceptick's head."

I have felt the grasp of scepticism. I have doubted, laughed at the folly of him who thinks that "day will dawn on the night of the grave," and have endeavoured to console myself with the barren comfort of this, at best, a world of care and anxiety. When life was young and a full flow of spirits made it "dance to notes of livelier measure," I complained not. But when time had run and the winter of life made his approach, when I looked back and found existence here is little more than expectation, or continual grasping for that we never reach, my heart grew sick. I looked on the world, its beauty had vanished. The flowers unfolded no charms, society was busy, all engaged; but I had seen the vanity of their pursuits. I looked upon the youth, just entering upon the active scenes of life, with a heart full of emotion, a fancy displaying the most brilliant colours and the most polished gems, with a mind full of expectation, looking forward to long and happy days. I could not, I wished not to dispel the illusion; but what will this youth have gained when his race of three score years and ten is run. Like me he may then sit down upon some mouldering remnant of an oak, and say, "I have lived and have toiled, I

have sought for knowledge, I have hoped for happiness, but I have not been happy. When my labour was successful it was often injurious, and when I obtained knowledge it pained me to think how little I could know." When my friends began to fall by the shafts of death, when I had followed one by one to the narrow house all that was dear to my heart, when I saw myself like some solitary tree, blasted by the lightnings of heaven, and my branches mouldering at my feet.*******

Then I asked some other consolation than to be told all that was dear is gone for ever, and that I shall soon be laid beneath the clods of the valley, to be eaten by worms! Then I said let me believe, find in the anticipation of another world the bliss denied me in this. Let me dream of futurity if it be illusion when I am dead I shall feel no pang of disappointment.

Those who are acquainted with the religion of Christ will readily perceive its adaptation to man in circumstances like these. It points to another world, informs us this world is not our abiding place, is not our final home; that we are placed here as in a disciplinary state, preparatory to our entering a world where the painful emotions are never excited, where parting and disappointment can never diminish our felicity or cause a sigh.

I have courted philosophy, I have felt proud to call her mine. I delight in her conversation still, and no slanders, however loudly uttered, shall ever make me blush to be called a philosopher. The study of nature, the acquisition of knowledge, opens a prolifick source of pure and rational pleasure; but this pleasure is much refined when united with a firm belief in a future state of existence, and an unwavering confidence in divine protection.—Nothing is more pleasing than to look upon the world as under the care of a Being who regards it with love, and will finally say to the living and the dead of the intelligent part, "loose the shackles of your mortality, the badges of sin and misery, rise to the kingdom of your father and enjoy the bounties of his table, and the joys of his presence for ever and ever."

A Believer.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

Rochester, Feb. 15th, 1827.

Mr. Brownson: Sir—As I am a friend to liberality in sentiment, to the right of private judgement and free discussion, I would submit to you the following facts in reference to my father-in-law, John Chapman, who departed this life full in the faith of the salvation of all men. Though not a Universalist myself, I submit them for you to make such use of them, as in your judgement may be deemed proper and useful to your readers. And for these reasons:

First, because it is a common saying among the othodox, that a man who is a Universalist will renounce his doctrine before he dies, if he should be sensible of his end and rational in his last moments. Secondly, because many friends of the deceased are among the readers of your Advocate. And thirdly, because it is already reported, among the orthodox, that he died in the agonies of despair on account of his doctrine. Father John Chapman experienced, as it is called, the religion of Jesus Christ at the age of 22, joined the Calvinist Baptist shortly after, with whom he associated, as a leading member, for a number of years, until he experienced an extraordinary conversion to the Abrahamick faith, as he termed it. He gave me an account of his religious exercises two days before he died, which I will here relate. While he believed that all mankind by the fall of Adam lost communion with God, became under his curse and wrath, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell eternal!—And that God, out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some few, a small part, to be saved from that state of sin and misery, into which all had been plunged by an eternal decree of God: and that God had not only passed by all the rest of his creatures, but, in his eternal purpose, doomed them to endless punishment; and those too, who were no more worthy of punishment than the elect, inasmuch as all were deserving of eternal punishment, in the fullest and highest sense of the term.—While he believed this he felt in his heart that God was Love. And while he was teaching this doctrine, with the love of God shed abroad in his heart, he was struck with horour and condemnation, at the idea of instructing his hearers to believe that God, who is *Love*, had doomed the greater part of his own creatures to eternal misery. This reflection drove him to the holy scriptures for relief to his troubled mind. He searched them daily for a long time, absorbed in meditation, reflection, and a prayerful state of mind. At length in one of his sleepless nights, he was taken shaking like Belshazzar, and, as he termed it, he felt moved by the Holy Spirit to repeat one psalm and four chapters; but I do not recollect where he said they may be found, except two were in the Old Testament and two in the New. The 4th chapted which he repeated, he said expressed a full atonement for sin by Jesus Christ. When he had repeated these he cried out, "Lord it is enough! I believe, I believe." He stopped shaking and commenced rejoicing, and felt happy in the faith of God's Universal Love. [Here I will mention that our mother has told us, that she well recollected the time of his shaking, and of his bursting out in strains of praises to God. Also, she has told us that previous to that time, for several weeks, he appeared to be in a continual state of study, meditation and reflection: and frequently he

would leave his work in the field, come into the house, take his bible, read a few minutes, and go to his work again without saying a word. It may be proper in this place to state, that he was a man of extraordinary memory, and would repeat the most scripture of any man I ever saw. He was so conversant with the bible, that on hearing any part of it read wrong he could correct it at once His wife, who has long since slept, would speak to her children with tears in her eyes, of their father's sincerity in the faith of the universal salvation of all men; and of his daily walk as a Christian, which, indeed was not a little repugnant to the feelings of other Christians around him. She would tell them how rejoiced he appeared to be after his conversion to the faith, that God had created so many beings for that enjoyment of which he daily had a foretaste. Thus he lived and enjoyed the faith of the universal Love of God, and was a warm and zealous advocate of the doctrine he believed for more than thirty years. During his last sickness he often spoke of his Abrahamick faith, and of the hope which he had as an "Anchor of his soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." With penitent language he expressed a sorrow for sin, that he had not set better examples before his children and the world. He would tell of his falling into diverse temptations and besetting sins, yet with an unshaken faith in the blood of Jesus, that it would cleanse him and the whole human family from all sin. He had kept the faith, and, well aware that his course was almost finished, he manifested a desire to make us a visit before his departure. Accordingly he was removed to my house about two weeks before he died, where I was permitted to be an ear witness of his last confessions and last words, and they manifested his full confidence in his God. He spoke much of his faith and of his sorrow for sin, and wished to live longer only to set better examples Two days before he died he spoke freely of his departure to be with Christ, mentioned the common saying, that a Universalist would renounce his belief before he died and with tears in his eyes, and his countenance beaming with heaven, he related his experience as I have before mentioned, and repeated to us the promises of God, both from the Old and New Testaments; and then expressed himself nearly in these words. "I would not deny the promise God made to faithful Abraham for ten thousand worlds. No, if I should deny my faith in the salvation of all men I should deny my God. I should deny the Holy Ghost which moved me to speak when I was brought into the Abrahamick faith." He requested us repeatedly to have a man, who believed in the salvation of all men, to preach his funeral sermon. As he grew near his end he was asked several questions relative to his future state, which he would always answer with satisfaction and apparent joy. A few minutes before his death, I asked him if he was sensible of his end, he answered "Yes." On asking him if he felt as if he was going to that God who made us all? He answered "yes, yes," and to all appearance with extreme animation. In a few minuets, he swooned away and fell asleep, as I humbly trust, in the arms of Jesus, in the 66th year of his age, on the 7th of February, 1829. His funeral was attended by Rev. Mr. Knapp, according to his request.

MARK DANIELS.

A DREAM.

MR. EDITOR: I am well aware that you have a great antipathy to dreams, but it is probable you dream sometimes yourself, for we all, poor mortals, are obliged to seek some illusion to hide the wretchedness of reality. Whether you ever dream or not is however of no consequence, since you allow "the prophet that hath a dream to tell a dream."

I am indeed a dreaming mortal; and nearly all the happiness I find is in relating to my family and neighbours the wonderful visions I receive in my sleeping hours. I have lately had a very remarkable dream; and as I have not yet told it to any one, you shall be the first to hear it.

I had been reading your sermon on the dreaming prophets, and before I had read two pages, I found myself in a state neither sleeping nor waking, but just in the one to see strange sights and to be haunted by horrid fantasies. Methought I was wandering in some distant country, unlike earth, heaven or hell, where, in mid air, in Symmes concavity, or in the remote planet Herschel, I cannot tell. The country however seemed inhabited, but by what kind of beings it was impossible to ascertain. There appeared much bustle and activity, though by whom caused or for what purpose was not easily perceived.

Solitary, though apparently in the midst of life, I had wandered until weariness overcame me and I was compelled to seat myself on something like a rock, to dissipate my fatigue. All at once I discovered at a small distance from my feet, a singular race of animals, not more than a few inches in height, and entirely dissimilar from any known genus on our earth. I watched their movements, and from their animated looks, and the violent gestures of one, who seemed to be harranging the rest, I concluded there was some publick occasion for their meeting, and perhaps some mighty affair to their little community depended on their decision.

"A change came o'er the spirit of my dream."

I was sitting in a spacious temple which was thronged with, I thought the same race of beings, who though they assumed the form of men still retained a remarkably diminutive

size. They were in earnest consultation. Angry glances were frequently exchanged. Hard words, epithets of reproach were interchanged with a rapidity that baffled my conjectures respecting their powers of speech. The hand frequently grasped a dagger; and as the eye turned quick from an image suspended from the roof, to the speakers who were most noisy or most artful, I was apprehensive the sacredness of the place would be polluted with blood. Something like order was restored, when a young dandy-like looking fellow mounted the rostrum, or place where the orators stood to harrangue the assembly. He pronounced in a clear voice, with an accent and in a language perfectly familiar to my ear, the word "religion." Ah thought I, these little diminutive creatures have their religion, and what seems very natural, they have their disputes about it too.

The orator sent a wondering gaze over the multitude, cast his eyes to the roof of the building, then down to the floor, then upon something he held in his hand, and then with his face glowing with inexpressible enthusiasm pointed to a clumsy working image, which I had before remarked hanging from the roof. "There, there, deluded multitude," he said, "there is your God. The great being who has created our globe, who has fed our friends and cursed our enemies. Do you ask his history? hear it with tears and with reverence."

After looking at the roll in his hand, adjusting his cravat, and recovering from their wanings, a few unruly hairs nicely powdered, elevating his voice, and suiting his style to what he supposed the dignity of his subject, he commenced, "Twenty thousand moons ago, as our fathers and the prophets have told us, this world was unknown, no mountains were seen to rise; no vallies to creep; no plains to spread themselves before the eyes. There was no verdure, no flowers, no fruit, no animals, no living thing. Darkness brooded over the mighty void. Yawah, the spirit that lives in that image was not. Without father, or mother, he was begotten. He breathed, and all this mighty world rose into being. All beautiful and lovely the forests were planted, grains were sown, the animals, that delight in the shade, began their rambles, the birds began their musick in the grove, the fish their gambols in the wave. Yawah the great Being looked on his new made world—he saw no image of himself, none with whom he could converse, or who could prevent the universe from being to him an immense solitude, there was none with whom he could lighten his burden, or with whose heart he could hold sympathy. He spoke, and Man* the Lord of the creation, the pride of all being and the flower of all beauty, arose to be a companion for his Creator.

"This man," continued the orator, "is the stock whence we are derived. Being the peculiar delight of Yawah, he was loaded with powers innumerable and favours beyond measure. The Great Father cultivated a field, filled it with every thing pleasing to the sight and delicious to the taste. Here he placed this creature of his care and this object of his love—told him his duty and gave him directions to its performance. To this first of our race he gave a companion; and together they lived in all the felicity of love and all the joy of innocence. * * * * *

The scene changed. A great bird, some say an owl, others, one of a genus now extinct, enticed the female to leave the field, contrary to her Creator's orders, and to pluck a flower which he had reserved for himself. Awful were the consequences. Earth quaked; the heavens thundered; showers of blood covered the earth; fiery meteors shot through the atmosphere; the sun turned to blood, and the moon dissolved in tears—all was consternation. Night came rolling on, and Chaos had well nigh resumed her ancient dominion! Silence reigned in the spheres and it seemed all was gone.

The flower was plucked, what could be done? The command of the Creator was broken, and he must now send his beloved child to burn ten thousand years in a furnace, or lose his own character for veracity.

But, glory to the Highest, he found an expedient. He assumed the *form* of man, and permitted the great bird, who had led the woman astray, to tear that form into a thousand pieces! O how did the Highest suffer when this form was torn to pieces! O how great was his love to give up this his favourite, his well beloved, his only begotten form to be so terribly marred by the horrid talons of that wicked bird!

When that form was destroyed a thunderbolt with unerring aim struck an aged oak the pride of centuries—that image came all wet with blood of the Great Being. It cried for compassion; our fathers heard; they took it from its lone and sorrowful condition; they built this temple; they placed the image in that position; and were assured as long as they obeyed its words, they should be prosperous. Ah me! *Horrible dictu!* we heard a man last night say that image is nothing but a piece of wood, and that what was attributed to it, was done by its servants the priests. O blast the wretch! what horrid impiety! I stopped both my ears, and have been restless until now. I call upon you ye faithful to avenge your God, to preserve his worship by delivering over to the flames, the audacious wretch who uttered those blasphemous words."

He ceased, a cry of vengeance was heard. When suddenly an old man, venerable with

* I use this term because it comes the nearest of any we have, in meaning to the one used by the orator. The being of which he spoke was very different from man, but holds the same relative position in that world that man does in this.

years, and grave from experience rose, "Young man," he said to the orator, "can your God speak?" "Speak! yes with a voice that can ring from one end of the universe to the other." "Not so loud," replied the old man, "let him speak gently. Perhaps he can inform us what we shall do to the man, that has treated him so lightly. But I perceive he is silent. Perhaps it is best not to disturb him.

"Young man, you speak with vehemence, but there is such a thing as words without wisdom. I remember when that image received its station. I saw the corner stone of this temple laid. I laid it myself. But who laid the corner stone of this mighty universe I know not. I have seen five generations of my race. The sun has shined; the rains have fallen; and the earth has blest the hand of industry. The heretick and the orthodox, the believer and the infidel, have alike partaken the bounties of nature.

"I have seen wars, the miseries we have brought upon each other, but nature has not varied. The flowers have blossomed—the birds have tuned their throats—the Great Spirit has been good. I have seen the fires kindled; and the heretick consumed; but the sun shone no brighter, the earth did not increase in fertility, and we were not happier.

"Young man—I have seen many in my day who, like you, were full of zeal and destitute of experience, calling down fire from heaven to consume those they deemed enemies to the Great Spirit. But I never heard a voice from heaven applauding the act, nor have I seen those thus forward to deal forth the judgements of God, free from imperfection themselves. Often have I had to spread the mantle of charity over their vices. I reproach not them—I reproach not you. But has this man injured you? has he defrauded a neighbour? has he oppressed the widow, or grasped the orphan's portion? No.

"But he does not believe the story of the bird and the bleeding image,—he has spoken slightingly of your God. Is your God weak? does he require us to avenge his cause? or, like a good Father, compassionate the faults of men, forgive their errors, and labour to reform them?

"I have felt the power of the Great Spirit, but I have never seen him. He is every where, and his energy sustains the world. He can manage his own concerns. If our brother has done wrong, let us forgive him; let us teach him his errour, and persude him to renounce it. You would have him love the Great Spirit. Show him the Great Spirit has life, has power, has wisdom and goodness, and our brother will love him.

"Young man, were you never mistaken? I have been a thousand times, and have always been glad to have my mistakes corrected. There is a bare possibility that you have not told the story aright. Many tell it differently. If you are wrong, what would it be to put this man to death or to injure him for not believing you?

"Young man, learn thyself. Nature teaches us the Great Spirit. His words are plain. They need no interpreter. "Be just," is the whole they require. You have a book in your hand; you say it is the gift of the Great Spirit. I know nothing about books except one, and that teaches me to love my brethren and live in peace—to compassionate the afflicted—to relieve the oppressed—to do good to all. Let us then, my brother, attempt to correct our own errours, and leave the Great Spirit to avenge himself."

The old man had not done ere a tumult arose—a shower of epithets was hurled, and the old man was seized, as he pronounced his last word, and with the Infidel was dragged to the pile, the flames began to ascend—startled with the scene I awoke, thanking God 'twas all a dream. Yours, with esteem,

SOMNIATOR.

Mr. Editor: As Br. Asa Upson, of Hornellsville, Steuben county, was admitted into the fellowship of the Genesee Association at its last session, and from mistake or neglect was not pubished in its minutes, you will please to publish the following certificate.

Victor, Sept. 25, 1818.

This certifies whom it may concern, that the Genesee Association of Universalists, in the state of New-York, being satisfied of the virtues and talents of Br. Asa Upson, do cordially fellowship him as a preacher of the gospel of Christ, and hereby commend him to the kind care and attention of his brethren, wherever God in his providence shall call him.

Done in behalf of the Association,

JOHN S. FLAGLER, *Moderator.*

Hollis Sampson, } *Clerks.*
Oliver Ackley, }

Chardon, (Ohio) Feb. 12, 1829.

Dear Sir: The friends of liberal principles are holding a Jubilee in this country, on account of our signal victory obtained in Congress. We place Mr. Johnson's Report next in rank and importance to our justly celebrated Declaration of Independence. But let us not be deceived, nor fondly imagine that because we have had the good fortune to cut off one of the Hydra heads the beast is therefore slain, or that the deadly wound cannot be healed.—The enemy's park of battering artillery, it is true, has been spiked, but until it can be refitted he will resort to his old mode of warfare, and endeavour to carry on his approaches by sapping. He has been paid before hand for heating the poker, and we may as well expect the wolf to eat hay quietly in the sheepfold, as

that these saints in lawn will ever willingly cease to disturb the repose of mankind or let us alone until we swallow down our spittle:—Therefore *onward* must be our motto.

E. P. Jun.

Editor of Gospel Advocate.

Extract from the Black Book—by Mrs. Royall.

In all countries, and in all ages, from the Druids down to brother Beecher, priests have aimed at universal power; this may be accounted for thus; all men wish others to think as they do on all subjects, but more particularly on religion; this is natural, and such is the nature of man, that he devises means to compel others to think as he does; but no means are so effectual as power, and no means are more successful in acquiring power than money—*money*, for which the Saviour of the world was sold—*money*, which "makes black white, foul fair, wrong right, base noble, old young, cowards valiant, buys religion, places thieves with senators on the bench, and old foolish widows wed again." Thus these priests have always aimed at unconditional obedience; this point being gained, the rest is easy. Some difficulty arises out of this view of the case; how is universal opinion to be reconciled to the priests? It cannot, they are passive tools, which the priest uses at his pleasure.

But let us inquire who these men are, that have turned the world upside down, and dare lift their hands against our sacred constitution? Are they gentlemen? No. Or the sons of gentlemen? No. Is it our enlightened senators, judges, or statesmen—are they men of respectable descent? No! I ask who are these men, that dare aim such a deadly blow at our liberties? The refuse, the rabble, the sweepings of our town, the scum of the earth, picked up in our streets, picked up every where, people of no property bound by no law, held by no tie to society; these are called pious young men, not educated, though that is the pretence, but fed and clothed upon false charity, upon the money squeezed from the poor widow, the orphan, little children, and industrious mechanicks; great strapping fellows, instead of maintaining the aged, the poor, and disabled, those have to maintain them.

These fellows are thrown into one of their Theological schools, and after a few lessons, in which they are taught to look upon all other sects as hereticks, model their countenance into that of demons, (to frighten Beelzebub,) throw every spark of nature out of their composition, make a long face, and a long prayer, and (more to the point) a long *purse*, and digest sundry ways and means to fill it. Those young vipers are turned loose upon the world; (many a good ploughman they have spoiled,) they are then formed into three grand divisions, each of which is subdivided into regiments, companies, and platoons, with (as all armies have) a goodly number of women (*Godly* ones) attached to each corps. All these are under able and experienced commanders, who see that they are properly drilled and disciplined before they take the field; one party is then sent off to convert the heathen for the sake of appearances; a second party is sent off to scour the country, and a third mounts the pulpit, and the remainder are set up as printers and booksellers, and thus like a pestilence over the land; not to scatter blessings amogst the distressed, root out ignorance, (as somebody wisely said of them,) or diffuse the lights of knowledge, to ennoble the age, or amend mankind; not to break the chains of slavery, or teach man his religious or political duties, or cultivate the arts or sciences, no; quite the reverse. Their object and their interest is to plunge mankind into ignorance, to make him a bigot, a fanatick, a hypocrite, a heathen, to hate every sect but his own, (the orthodox,) to shut his eyes against the truth, harden his heart against the distress of his fellow man, and purchase heaven by his money. This is the business of those *pious* young men; and to this end (as I shall soon make it appear) are those millions of dollars appropriated, which are wrung from ignorance and poverty. Is there no help; High heavens! Shades of our fathers; must this fair land, purchased with your blood, be wrested from us by a low ignorant rabble! Why talk of the delusions of blue laws, Hartford conventions, and witchcraft? This is the worst of all crafts. But let us look after these *pious* young men. I said they were divided into brigades, battalions, regiments, companies, and platoons—these platoons are so many foraging parties scouring the country, entering cities, towns and villages—they range regularly through every street, enter every house, beg of every individual in it, from the master to the scullion, the smallest child does not escape them; they go into oyster cellars, barbers' shops, shoe blacks, and sailors do not miss them; they creep into widows hovels, and the orphans shed, like the frogs of Egypt; they stop the traveller on his journey, and beg of the way-faring man; they sneek in at kitchen doors, lost to all sense of shame, and cajole ignorant cooks, chambermaids, and scullion boys. They preach up Juggernaut, (the true Juggernaut is amongst ourselves,) and draw such pictures of heathens going to hell by thousands, that they frighten ignorant women and children into compliance. They will take no denial, "you will go to hell if you do not give money to spread the gospel;" some will take out their watch and give the people so many minutes to consider upon the matter, and in case of refusal, everlasting torments in hell is denounced against them. "Oh, sir, I have but one dollar to buy me clothes, indeed sir I cannot spare it." Oh give it, to send the gospel to the heathen, and trust to the Lord. Why

don't they trust to the Lord? No! They trust to the cash; thus they wring the last cent from poor silly girls, who in many instances are sent to the grave by wearing a thin dress in winter; duped of their hard earnings (which would have clothed them comfortably,) by those *pious* young men. "Give as you would wish you had when you come to die, don't you read that Christ says go into all nations and preach the gospel? (Christ said take ye neither script nor purse.) When we go to the heathen, the heathen say, "Why did you not come to us sooner? Thousands of us have died and gone to Hell for want of the gospel." This is downright blasphemy against God, and if he could be thwarted in his providence for want of money; if he has the power to save souls, and will not do it without robbing the poor—in other words, without being paid for it, he is worse than Juggernaut; any one who can swallow such an absurdity as this, we pronounce him more ignorant than the heathen.

RELIGIOUS INQUIRER, NEW SERIES.

We have received the first number of the 8th volume of this paper, the first of the new series much improved in appearance and in size. The paper is published at Hartford, Conn, by Menzies Rayner and edited by Menzies Rayner and Lucius R. Paige. It is issued weekly on a full sheet, quarto, at $2,00 a year, if paid in advance, to which 50 cents will be added if not paid within the first six months. From the specimens we have before had of the abilities of the editors, and from what we have in the number before us, we have no doubt the Religious Inquirer will be one of the most useful papers in the connexion. We trust its former patrons will continue their support, and we hope the friends of liberal sentiments everywhere will encourage its editors, by a liberal patronage. May God prosper the editors in their benevolent exertions, and give the reward for their labours, which they seem so earnestly to desire—the triumph of truth.

"*Priest-craft exposed and primitive Christianity defended.*"—This is the title of a paper published at Lockport, Niagara county, N. Y. It is published monthly on a full sheet about the size of the Advocate, and makes a volume of 192 pages for one dollar. Its design as expressed in the title, is to expose the various plans in agitation for aggrandizing the priesthood—to lay open clerical impositions and to recall the attention of the people to the pure principles of the Gospel. It is conducted with a good share of talent and we wish it much success. We have received the prospectus for the second volume and are highly pleased with the independent course the editors pledge themselves to follow. We would that there were thousands of liberal publications where there is now but one. EDITOR.

"*Star in the West.*"—This is a paper published at Eaton, Ohio, by J. Kidwell and D. D. Hall. It is published monthly on a half sheet, about the sized sheet as the one on which ours is printed. Price one dollar a year.

This paper is devoted to the cause of God's Impartial Love. It is conducted with ability, and when it is enlarged, as we understand it is intended to be, it will be eminently useful in dispelling the darknes which our eastern bigots are endeavouring to cast over the wertern horizon.

We wish the editors success. We say to them be prepared; the orthodox discomfited at the east are now rolling their huge torrent to the west. But we have much confidence in the west. The friends of liberal sentiment, in Ohio and other western states, are numerous. We say to them stand firm, ready to repel any invasion upon their religious liberty.—ED.

REPENTANCE.—No subject is more talked, preached and written about than repentance, and, as it generally happens in such cases, probably no subject in religion is less understood. "You must repent," is the cry from every quarter, and by those too who have not the least conception of the import of the term. We recommend as an antidote to this evil the sermon from Br. A. H. Curtis, which we publish in this number. We trust it will be read with satisfaction, by all who wish to become acquainted with the gospel of Christ.

OBITUARY.—We have the melancholy task to notice the death of our friend GERSHOM TUTTLE, one of the former proprietors of the Gospel Advocate. He died of an inflamation of the brain, at Westmoreland, Oneida county, on the 24th Feb. ult. His health had been delicate for some time, but he was able to attend business, and was engaged at the time procuring subscribers for the Advocate, and in settling his accounts in the publishing department. He was suddenly attacked, and lingered but a few days. He was speechless some days before his death, but appeared composed and seemed to meet the messenger death with calmness and resignation. He has gone in the midst of his usefulness. The great Parent called, why we know not, but though we weep his loss, we trust we shall meet him where death is unknown.

ADDITIONAL AGENTS.*

Luther Couch, Hume, Allegany co. N. Y. *Abner Adams*, Pike, Allegany co. N. Y.—*S. S. Sheldon*, Wilson, Niagara co. N. Y.—*Samuel Gillis*, Esq. P. M. Clermontville, Pa. Capt. *Elijah Deeken*, Nanticoke, Broome co. N. Y.—*H. W. Standart*, Monroeville, Huron co. Ohio—*Samuel Russell*, Esq. P. M. Alfred, Allegany co. N. Y.—*James D. Ford*, Newark, Wayne co. N. Y.—*C. Howell*, Elmira, Tioga co. N. Y.—*Levi Davis*, Esq. P. M. Greenwood, Steuben co. N. Y.—*Sidney Drake*, Ludlowville, Tompkins co. N. Y.—*Geo H. Patrick*, Geddes, Onondaga co. N. Y.—*James N. Ayers*, Esq. P. M. Truxville, Richland county, Ohio.

☞*We continue to publish additional agents. Those editors whose papers are circumscribed in their circulation will know where to send.

Poetick Department.

FROM THE CAYUGA PATRIOT.

BENEVOLENCE.

How sympathetick is thy soul,
Benevolence divine!
How mild and gentle thy control—
Thy influence how benign!
From thee those tears of pity flow,
That soften and assuage our woe.

Thy sensibility is keen,
When sorrow drops a tear;—
Thou mak'st her furrow'd cheeks serene,
Thy words allay her fear.
Thy smiles a healing balm impart—
A cordial that revives the heart.

Thy Lib'ral hand affords relief
To mis'ry worn and pale;
Thy bosom throbs when sighing grief
Relates her tragick tale:
Then shall thy sympathies awake
To bind the heart which sorrows break.

Philanthropy, thy sister kind,
Doth all thy goodness share;
With thine her labours are combin'd
To banish grief and care.
Howard that gen'rous flame possess'd—
It glow'd within his manly breast.

To the afflicted and forlorn,
The kind relief he gave,
And e'en the wretch expos'd to scorn,
His pity deign'd to save.
The suffering captive he reliev'd,
And joy'd the heart that long had griev'd.

When Innocence is sore oppress'd,
Or suffering Virtue grieves,
Thy presence gives the sufferer rest,
And ev'ry pang relieves.
The wretched outcast vile and poor,
Is never driven from thy door.

On him thou dost thy gifts bestow,
With sympathy sincere;
And down his visage cause to flow
The tributary tear,
With gratitude his heart is warm'd,
His eye is with thy bounty charm'd.

The hapless wretch whom, for his guilt,
Stern Justice dooms to die—
For him thy tender heart will melt,
Thy bosom heave a sigh.
His follies thou wouldst fain forgive,
And bid the malefactor live.

The widow's and the orphan's prayer,
Is ne'er despis'd by thee;
Thou mak'st it thy peculiar care
T' assuage their misery;
While tott'ring age with hoary hairs,
Thy ready bounty freely shares.

Sweet Seraph of celestial form,
Who dost our pains beguile;
Adversity thou canst disarm,
Make sickness wear a smile,—
Thy voice revives the drooping soul,
And bids her sorrow cease to flow.

Benevolence, with thy pure flame,
O cause my heart to glow;
Teach me to venerate thy name,
And all thy virtues know—
Thy sacred virtues that afford
A lasting and a sure reward. J. M. D.

From the New-England Weekly Review.

TO———

Yes, Lady, thou wilt die—That lip of snow
And that pale brow foretell thy early lot;
The wing of death is o'er thee—thou wilt go
Where broken hearts and blighted flowers are not.
Thou art too beautiful to linger where
The rainbow brightens but to melt away,
And the sweet sounds, that wander on the air,
But swell the dirge of sorrow and decay.

Yes thou wilt die. Thy spirit soon will leave
This dull cold exile for its place on high,
And like a bright cloud on a summer eve,
Melt in the deeper glories of the sky;
Thy home will be where bluer skies are glassed
In brighter streams mid Love's undying bowers,
And where the winds of ruin never passed,
Nor serpents writhed round Passion's sweetest flow'rs.

Aye thou wilt die—and I shall linger here,
When all the blossoms of the heart are fled,
To muse on thee, and mourn with bitter tear
The cold, the lost, the beautiful, the dead;—
And as life's stars in loneliness depart,
Thy memory still, amid the deepning gloom,
Will shine upon the ruins of my heart,
Like a lone fire-fly on the midnight tomb. G.

LIFE.

BY MRS. HALE.

God, thou hast fixed the date of man,
And who would lengthen out his span?
Enough of pains, and toils, and fears,
Meet in the round of seventy years:
And earth must like a desert spread,
When all life's flowers are plucked or dead.

One year—the season's changes o'er—
What would a thousand teach us more?
Each hath its garlands and its gloom,
Its joyous festival and doom;
And ancient lyre, and modern lay,
Chant the same strain to welcome May.

'Tis day upon the eastern hills,
But shade, deep shade, yon valley fills,—
And thus, let centuries pass arrayed
In robe of mist, half night half shade,
Will morning come and wake the throng,
That plod life's beaten path along.

And see old night her crown put on,
Undimmed as when o'er Babylon
She wooed the Magi's thoughful eye
To trace the starry page on high;
And this the sky hath ever shone,
As bright, as boundless, as unknown.

And man is weak and wayward still,
As proud to plan, as prone to ill—
The vaunting knowledge he acquires
Is but the wisdom of his sires,
And still from age to age the same,
The chase of pleasure, wealth and fame.

And who would be a slave, and dwell
Forever in a dungeon cell,
Counting the links that form his chain?
Such is the soul that would retain
The fetters earth's dull prison binds,
To check the flight of deathless minds.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 1829. [NO. 6.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON
ON SIN, ITS ORIGIN AND EFFECTS.

BY L. S. EVERETT.

Delivered at Charlestown, Mass. Jan. 18—*Redelivered at Boston, Feb.* 1, 1829.

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Ezk. xviii. 20.

There is no fact more evident, and I may add, there is none more plainly expressed in the Bible, than that mankind will be suitably punished for their evil deeds. Among other preventives of crime and misery, this fact is set forth, in bold relief, as a beacon, to warn us of the dangers to which, by our very natures, we are exposed. We have it, line upon line, in the scriptures; we find an illustration of it in our experience; we behold it demonstrated in the misery of the ungodly; yet, blinded mortals often act as if no such fact existed. How often are we seduced from our allegiance to God—how frequently do we enlist under the banner of sin, as if our chief enjoyments were to result from doing wrong! And what is there in the way of the wicked that can be admired? or where shall we find the boasted pleasures of sin? Alas, for the ungodly! in their path are misery and death!

There was among the Jews a traditional proverb, that the sins of the fathers should be visited upon the children to the third and fourth generations. This sentiment, at once repugnant to reason, and deleterious in its application to the mind, belongs to that class of evils which a sound philosophy disproves; and, though sustained by ancient, and somewhat by modern superstition, must be removed before a correct system of morality can be established. The doctrine of *imputation*, on the one hand, has a direct tendency to prevent moral improvement, by suggesting to the mind that a load of guilt and condemnation rests upon those who have not transgressed any known commandment; and, on the other, it tends to encourage a violation of the law of God, by promising an escape from the consequences, on easy conditions.

And, indeed, there is some reason to suppose, that designing or deluded men have resorted to the expedient of inculcating the errour I am examining, with the dishonourable and unworthy motive of substituting Faith for good works, thereby making justification depend upon implicit confidence in their own dogmas. For, if by faith we can obtain the benefit of imputed righteousness, faith must be of great consequence; and, if faith be so important, those who defend it must be worthy of all respect; and if thus worthy, they should be well supported. Thus you will find that the whole mystery is unfolded by the language of certain men of Ephesus—"By this craft we get our living."

The doctrine of imputed sin, has been incorporated into modern Christianity. It has been maintained by thousands, as expressed in the language of the New-England Primer, that "in Adam's fall, we sinned all." And this quaint expression has borrowed, from the unanimity with which it has been received, and the veneration with which it has been often repeated, the celebrity (though not the truth) of inspiration. The same doctrine is discovered in the absurd hypothesis of *total depravity*. Adam, it is supposed, ate sour grapes, and his children's teeth, it is added, are set on edge. And well would it be for the cause of rational Christianity, if the evil consequences of his transgression were limited, by divines, to the fourth generation. But, as if the Jewish proverb did not go far enough, we are told, that his sin, and his guilt, and his condemnation, are visited upon all his posterity to the present day, and will extend to all hereafter; until, accumulated by the lapse of ages, it shall ripen into infinite grief, and truly amazing wo! But these errours will find their refutation in the farther enlargement of our subject. We will notice,

1. *The origin of sin.* It has been supposed (with how little reason I leave my hearers to judge) that Sin, the curse of mortals, and the grief of God, originated in Heaven. This conclusion seems to be the result of honest ignorance. Mankind seem to have been puzzled to account for the origin of this evil, so universally felt, and at length imputed the astonishing infatuation by which they had been often led astray, to the seductive operations of an invisible agent. The inventors of this theory did not stop to inquire who tempted the devil, or who tempted the devil's tempter; but satisfied themselves with the vague and indefinite supposition, that, as a man could not sin without a tempter, and as man could not tempt himself, the evil might as well be

charged upon some invisible being; and this invisible being might as well be called a devil as any thing else.

Now admitting the personality of the devil, for the sake of argument, and that he is as bad as he is represented, it admits of a doubt whether it is just to charge upon him so great an amount of criminality. For could he be allowed to speak in his own defence, he might, for ought we know to the contrary, plead, in extenuation of his guilt, the fact, that some thrice cunning deceiver had formerly allured him into transgression.

But the truth is, the writings of a brother in the faith, and a fellow-labourer in the vineyard of our common Lord, have effectually exploded the notion of a personal devil; and the doctrine under consideration is left without support, and I had almost said, without advocates. The abondonment of this doctrine has left us free to affirm, that sin originates in the lusts of the flesh, and is a consequence resulting from the want of correct information.

Man is naturally a subject of want. His physical organization requires that he shall eat and drink; and the inclemencies of a succession of seasons require that he should be clothed and sheltered. His happiness is dependent on his success in procuring the means to supply his wants; and it would be strange indeed, if, in the pursuit of this one object, and governed, as they are, by the same motives, the multitudes of the human race should not sometimes infringe upon each others' rights.

Sin consists, not in stepping over an imaginary line, but in doing that which derrogates from the dignity of human nature, or destroys the happiness of our fellow-creatures. There is a law of eternal rectitude enstamped upon the consciences of all created intelligences; and this law—the law of God—the law of universal nature—requires, that, in the pursuit of happiness we should have a suitable regard for the happiness of others. Do we, therefore, to gratify our ambition, recklessly trample upon the rights of others—do we, to add to our possessions, obtain by force, cunning or fraud, that which belongs to another—do we, regardless of their dependent situation, rob the widows, or the fatherless, of their scanty pittance—do we, for purposes of self-aggrandizement, disregard the honest opinions, or even the prejudices of our fellow-beings; or, do we wantonly sport with the limited enjoyment of any beast of the field, or fowl of the air, or reptile of the earth; then do we sin against the law of our God. Who does not discover from this, that sin originates in the lust of the flesh? or who is so blind as not to see, that it consists in a lawless and unnecessary indulgence of those propensities which were bestowed upon us for wise and good purposes? Is not this the language of your experience? Does not all that you know confirm it?

But the language of the Bible is in unison with the sentiment just advanced. Saith an apostle—"When lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin." If we trace the metaphor here introduced, it will serve to illustrate our general proposition. When the desires of the flesh take council together, regardless of the happiness of mankind, determinations are produced in the mind of a similar character. These determinations, when manifested in overt acts, are found at variance with that universal law to which I have already referred. Thus, by suffering the low and grovelling propensities of our nature, to obtain the ascendency, conceptions are found, which militate with the principles of eternal right; and when mankind are habitually under the control of such propensities, they are, characteristically, children of the adversary.

Again: the same apostle says—"Let no man say when he is tempted, 'I am tempted of God,' for God tempteth no man, neither is he tempted; but when a man is tempted, he is drawn away by his own lusts, and enticed." Now, the same tempter that whispered in the ear of Eve, "Thou shalt not surely die," is ever present to the human race, to lead them astray from the path of uprightness. The flippant deceiver, by his wily arts gilds the bait, and by promising us life, or an escape from the consequences of crime, allures us into the way of transgression. This ever-present tempter is too often successful in operating upon our natural inclinations; and the number of his victories, have, perhaps, contributed, more than any thing else, to sustain the notion that sin and depravity are hereditary and total.—But this supposition, when duly examined, will be found incorrect. It is necessary that a line of distinction should be drawn, between our liability to sin, and an innate or hereditary incapacity to do right.

Observe, 1. The lusts of the flesh being an essential ingredient of our Nature, it may be truly said, that all intelligent beings are *liable* to sin. But from this we are not at liberty to infer, that mankind are either totally or partially depraved: For, as well might it be said, that all men are naturally inclined to run into the fire, because many have unfortunately been burned: Or, as well might we say, while reasoning on the laws of gravitation, on beholding the ascent of a rocket, that all solid bodies are naturally inclined to fly off from the earth.

2. Admitting that mankind are depraved, it does not follow that they are totally so. The reasonableness of this proposition is apparent from the consideration, that there are degrees of criminality; which could not be admitted, were mankind totally incapable of thinking a good thought, or of doing a good action. And,

3. If mankind were totally depraved, and entirely sinful, by nature, they could not be morally accountable. For in order to be accountable to any law, we must understand the nature of it; and inasmuch as we learn every thing from experience and comparison, a knowledge of any thing good must be obtained from something of the same nature within ourselves. Hence,

4. The depravity of man, or his extreme *liability* to sin, must be regarded as his misfortune, rather than his fault. This fact is evident, both from the nature of the case, and from the divine testimony on the subject. St. Paul informs us, that "the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope."

This mode of reasoning avoids the disagreeable alternative of supposing that infants are exposed, by their depravity, to the righteous displeasure of God; and it fully exonerates the character of the Deity from the charge of having formed and created us so miserably destitute of any thing to recommend us to his favourable regard. And if we have taken a right view of our subject, it teaches us that the source of moral evil is within ourselves; and that sin is produced by temptation, operating upon our natural desires and inclinations. St. Paul informs us that "the flesh lusteth against the spirit;" and from our own experience, we know how often we have been brought into captivity to the law of sin and death.

There is a monitor within—"a God within the mind," which admonishes us to beware of the seductions of sin; yet it too frequently turns out, that the passions of the human heart are suffered to blind the eyes of the understanding. The keen penetrations of reason are often exchanged for the embellishments of fancy; and the plainest dictates of common sense are frequently bartered away for the rantings of an overheated imagination. The hero of the day deems it honourable to take the life of his comrade—the fanatick thinks he is doing God service by traducing the character of his neighbour—the bigot, by his intolerance, violates the common civilities of life—the drunkard, the libertine, the miser, the knave, are stimulated to commit their depredations upon the peace of society by one and the same cause; and all are misguided by their unsubdued propensities. Pride is, by this magick power of a corrupt heart, transformed into decency; covetuousness into prudence; and persecution into a zeal for God! So of other fashionable vices: intemperance is merely the pastime of an hour; libertinism is but a species of gallantry, and knavery is but the best end of a good bargain! Shall we inquire—"from whence come wars and fightings?" An answer is implied in the following apostolick question—"Come they not hence, even of your own *lusts* that war in your members?" This matter is ably summed up in the following quotations. "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." "In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

2. *The effect of sin.* This interesting part of our subject naturally presents itself under the three following heads: The nature; the adequateness, and the certainty of punishment.

The nature of the punishment inflicted by the faithful hand of God, is well expressed by the term *death.* This term conveys to our minds the idea of an extinction of some desirable principle of enjoyment. It is borrowed from language usually employed to express the idea of natural death; and very appositely represents a suspension of the operation of those more noble faculties of the mind, in the employment of which we find our truest pleasures. It forcibly expresses what we have all felt, in a greater or less degree; I mean that state of darkness and alienation of soul, which we have experienced in consequence of doing wrong. That it does *not* signify either eternal annihilation, or endless misery, is argued from the fact that some *have*, and all *may* pass, from this state of death, to its opposite, a state of life and enjoyment. "We know," saith an apostle, "that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren."

The following texts are sufficient to illustrate the nature of this death. "The wages of sin is death;" "I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came sin revived and I died;" "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;" "But God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ."

2. That all punishment for sin will be adequate to the ends of justice, may be argued from the power and goodness of God. Whatever justice may require, an almighty Being can inflict. Though it should demand a suspension of the life of Nature itself; though it should require that worlds on worlds should be swept with the besom of destruction to indiscriminate ruin; the omnifick energies of Him who gave them form and motion could speak the dreadful word, and it would be done. But should almighty power be left to operate uncontrolled, the work of punishment, begun in equity, might result in the direful ravings of malignant vengeance. We must look, therefore, to Power, aided, directed, and we may add, controlled by goodness, for the assurance that the object of justice shall be obtained by an infliction of punishment.

What, then, does Justice require? It requires that every sinner should be reformed,

It requires—it *demands*, that every unholy propensity, every ungodly desire, every unsanctified affection, every rebellious emotion, should be subdued, should be duly restrained, should be brought into a willing subjection to a God of unlimited love, and unpurchased benevolence. In few words, it requires that all mankind should be holy as the Lord our God is holy, should be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect. This glorious subjection is imperatively demanded by every attribute of God, by every precept, and every promise, and every threatening, and every command of the gospel. Nature requires it: it requires that all the wild disorder of sin and its concomitant wo, should be stilled; that the hills and the vales, the ocean and the earth, should resound with the aspirations of innocence, and be rendered vocal with the universal hymn of joyful praise! Punishment, therefore, in order to be adequate to the end required by justice, must be of such a nature, and so administered, that all the moral maladies of the human race will be removed; that death may be swallowed up of life; and that joy and gladness may fill the universe of God. But,

3. *The certainty of punishment.* That God will certainly punish his children when they do wrong, is argued from the necessity of chastisement to reclaim them. Such is the nature of man, that he must learn from *experience*. He must taste the evil and the good, before he can learn to avoid the former and prize the latter. It is necessary, therefore, that God, in faithfulness, should administer correctiou, whenever we sin, that we may be induced to return to our duty, and thus become partakers of his holiness.

But the bible is explicit on this point. It teaches us that whatever may be our crimes, there is no way by which we can escape their consequences. It reads, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"—"Behold! the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner"—"Every man shall be rewarded according to his deeds, whether good or bad"—"God will by no means clear the guilty"—"To them who are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile"—"The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness." &c.

The same sentiment which we find expressed in these passages, is conveyed with equal clearness and force, in the language of our text. "THE SOUL [not some other person] that sinneth, IT SHALL DIE." The meaning evidently is;—The person, who, in thought, word, or deed, transgresses against the law of God, shall suffer the consequence, and that without the possibility of an escape. The language is imperative: the sinner SHALL DIE.

Will the question arise, how long shall punishment continue? The answer is, as long as sin remains to perpetuate it. And when mankind are saved *from sin*, this moral death will be swallowed up in life. Sin, as we have seen, began in the flesh—it originated in the natural propensities of man—it is an evil which grows out of our imperfections—it is sustained by the predominance of our carnal appetites and passions over the intellectual man. Christ condemned this evil in the flesh, and pointed us to the period of its destruction. When, therefore, He shall have accomplished his work, he will transfer his kingdom to the Father, and joy and peace shall gloriously triumph.

In scripture, if I rightly judge, we have no definite proof that sin shall exist in another world, or that it ever did exist in any other than this; and, in the absence of all proof to the contrary, it may be reasonable to infer from its nature, that it will cease, when we are removed from the temptations which beset us on earth. The conclusion is a natural one, that the causes of sin must necessarily cease with the flesh or earthly constitution of man; for it is evident that man would not sin without temptation presented by that principle which lusteth against the spirit: And, in his immortalized state, he will not be subject to temptation.

The world to come, is said to be put in subjection to Christ. That spirit of disobedience, which, in scripture, is sometimes denominated the devil, is stiled "the god of this world."—The supposition, therefore, that sin will exist in another mode of being, is, in effect, the admission, that he is also the god of the world to come! This would lead us too far, and would derogate greatly from the honour which belongeth to God only. And it will be recollected by the hearer, that Christ took part of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver those who through fear of death were all their life time, &c."

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS.

From the nature and certainty of punishment, we are powerfully admonished to abstain from doing any thing that can prevent the happiness or limit the enjoyments of our fellow-creatures. When, therefore, temptations are presented before us, however great the enticement may be, it will be prudent and wise in us to inquire what effect will be produced by our conduct, upon the feelings or persons of those around us. Will my profanity corrupt the morals of the rising generation?—will my levity disturb the devotions of my neighbours?—will my moroseness disquiet my family?—will my excesses dishonour my religious professions?—will my disregard of the requisitions of my faith perpetuate the bondage of my

fellow-creatures—are questions which cannot be too frequently put to our consciences. By this rule we may safely estimate our conduct, and by this standard we may try our every action. And if we find, on a careful examination, that our past lives have not been conformed to this rule, it will be a very profitable and I think a very delightful task, to amend them. For it is undoubtedly true, that such is the constitution of our nature, and such the law of the moral world, that we must be miserable so long as those around us are so. Thus is punishment set forth as a preventive of sin, and we are taught by it, to avoid the appearance of evil.

But it not enough that we abstain from sinning. The gospel requires that we should be active in every good word and work. To the end that we may live holy, active, and useful lives, the most powerful persuasives to virtue are presented to our view in the great reward of doing well. Look around you upon the virtuous part of community. See the good man! Is he a husband? how happy is his wife. Is he a father? how confiding are his lovely children. Is he a neighbour? What joy and peace are round about him.—See the good woman! Heaven is in her heart, and its bliss is depicted in her countenance.—See the good child! *There* is affection—*there* is a respect for parents—*there* is kindness—*there* is love—and *there*, *too*, is peace.

Need we look to another world, for the reward of virtue? No! *it is here!* Must we go into eternity for the torments of the wicked? No? *they are here!* Would you be happy?—be virtuous:—would you feel the holy comforts of divine grace?—be good:—would you enjoy a heaven of glory within you? be religious.

That these comforts, and these joys, may be widely disseminated—that truth may have free course, run, and be glorified—and that you may rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, may the blessing of God attend this humble effort, through Jesus Christ our Lord and ever blessed Portion.—AMEN.

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

NO. VI.

ON INSPIRATION.

Any man capable of putting three ideas together, must be convinced, from the remarks I have already made, that it is useless to contend that *every word* of the bible was dictated by the infallible spirit of truth. Certainly the bible which we have is not free from errours. But the least errour is fatal to the position that every word is inspired, if indeed inspiration be what people generally imagine. But there are some who conclude the Holy Ghost only dictated the arguments and doctrines, while the words were chosen by the writers themselves, This hypothesis does not obviate the difficulties, or reconcile the discrepancies, which are manifestly to be found in the sacred book. The instances we enumerated, to disprove that every word was inspired, bear equally hard against the supposition that all the arguments and doctrines are given by inspiration.

It would not be difficult to produce examples of false reasonings or illegitimate deductions, of unsupported premises and conclusions without premises,—but, lest some timorous soul might think my reverence for the book is less than it really is, I let them rest till called up by others, who may have more leisure and inclination to find fault. It will be enough to exhibit one or two examples of discrepancy in doctrine.

The Jewish lawgiver informs us, in the second precept of the decalogue, that God is a "jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generations, of them that hate him." The term jealous can hardly be applied to God. It is generally used in a bad sense, to express an ignoble passion; and though it is sometimes used in a good sense, it is still a sense inappropriate to God. In its best sense, jealousy means a strong desire to retain something which we have, or to which we have a claim, joined with the fear of losing it. But how God can *fear* he shall lose what he desires to retain is not very easy to conceive.

But it seems contrary to all ideas of moral justice, for God, because the fathers hate him, to punish this hatred in the persons of their descendants, even to the third and fourth generations. Some despotick governments, I know, have allowed bills of attainder, which had the effect to disfranchise or disinherit the children of him against whom they were passed; but our government, through the enlightened philanthropy which characterized its founders, prohibits all such bills; and I can hardly believe that God has not as clear ideas of justice as had the convention who framed our constitution.

But Ezekiel teaches us a doctrine very different from Moses. He assures us, in the name of the Lord, that we shall no longer use the proverb, "the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge;" that the soul that sinneth shall die, every one for his own sin, not the father for the trangression of the son, nor the son for the father. Did the Holy Ghost dictate both these doctrines? If he did, one would think he had forgotten the law he gave to Moses before he gave the one to Ezekiel, or, that during that lapse of years, had improved in the science of legislation, and was now ambitious to atone for the errours of his first attempts.

The Jewish lawgiver recommends the law of retaliation, commands us to follow the prin-

ciple, "an eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth, burn for a burn, hand for a hand," &c. That is, if a man put out one of my eyes, I am to put out one of his; if he knocks out one of my teeth, he must be served the same. This is not a very wholesome principle. It encourages revenge, and is calculated to keep up an endless train of wrongs and outrages. Jesus corrects this law, commands us not to resist the injurious, and instead of doing by others as they do by us, we are to do by them as we *would* they should do by us; that, instead of revenge, we should forgive our enemies, and do good unto them that injure us. These doctrines are in direct opposition to each other, and it seems not a little strange that God could be the authour of both. I am not ignorant of the exposition usually given to these passages, but I detest them all; they have little other effect than to make darkness still darker. I should indeed feel more obliged to the Holy Ghost, if he had used a little more precision in his statements; and I should be much more willing to give him the credit of dictating the book, if he had preserved a little more coherence in its several parts, and presented it in a manner so lucid that we should be at no loss to comprehend his meaning.

It is unnecessary to pursue this kind of reasoning farther: and, perhaps, I ought to make some apology to bible-worshippers for having carried it so far. But I am little accustomed to make truth pay homage to falsehood; and, as I have not yet learned to apologize for telling the truth, I think I shall not turn out of my way to commence the study now. I shall never deprecate the vengeance of those who advocate errour. I shall only claim the privilege to smile when they rage, and to pity them when they shrink from the approach of light.

The remarks already made evince that caution is necessary in proving a doctrine from the bible. Some of its doctrines are manifestly incorrect, whether we determine according to our natural ideas of justice, or by the suffrages of the later bible writers themselves. It is important, or rather necessary, even to determine the question whether any part is inspired, and if so, what part this is? Before answering either of them, it will be proper to answer another,—what is inspiration?

People generally suppose inspiration means an infallible aid from the Holy Ghost, which enables the subject to speak the truth and nothing but the truth, and to disclose facts worthy to be believed, which facts none of our senses are able by their constitutional power to discover. The mode or manner is various —dreams, visions, audible sounds, and inward suggestions, are those commonly enumerated. As for dreams, the writers of the bible very likely had them. We have them now, and we have no reason to doubt that the Jews had dreams as well as we. But as dreams are often incoherent and not worthy of much credit, I do not think them the safest sources of knowledge. Some, perhaps, can show why the dreams of the ancient Jews are more worthy of credit than ours; but, until they do this, I must say with Jeremiah, "the prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat?"

That they formerly had visions, and saw strange sights, none but incorrigible scepticks will presume to dispute. One tells us he was caught up to the third heaven, (whether in the body or out, he could not tell) and saw things which it was not expedient for him to relate. Others saw things which they did relate. But whether they were in the body or out, asleep or awake, is more than I know, and in some instances probably more than they knew themselves. Perhaps the testimony of such persons would have weight in a court of law, especially three thousand years after their death, though rejected with contempt by their contemporaries.

Audible sounds they might have heard. I have heard many. Sometimes they told the truth, and sometimes they did not. The only kind of inspiration which to me appears rational, is inspiration by *suggestion*. The word inspiration is from *in* and *spiro*, to breath, and signifies something breathed into or suggested to the mind. Hence the Holy Ghost is said to breath into the mind, or suggest to the mind, the lessons he wishes it to communicate. The inspired person feels a certain impulse, under the influence of which he speaks. If he feel the impulse of truth, what he says will be true; if the impulse of errour, what he pronounces will be false.

Admitting then that we ought not to disbelieve that the writers, or some of the writers of the bible, were inspired by the Holy Ghost, we must still enquire who or what is the Holy Ghost? Notwithstanding I have taken no small pains to become acquainted with this celebrated personage—notwithstanding I have read several genealogical and physiological accounts of him, I must acknowledge, what I know will not much recommend me to my pious readers, that I know but very little about him. People have talked and written a great deal about him: whether correct or not, probably an *uninspired* man ought not to assume the province of determining. But as I am no believer in *Ghosts* nor Hobgoblins, I conclude that nothing more should be understood by the term as we find it in the christian scriptures, than A HOLY SPIRIT. I know it is sometimes called *the* Holy Spirit, but this is only a mark of distinction by which we are to know the spirit of which the writer speaks, is that holy spirit, ardour, energy, or disposition which governed or actuated Christ and his Apostles. I assume this position here, but

shall prove it, to my own satisfaction at least, when I come to treat upon the third person of the "ever blessed Trinity."

The sacred writers were inspired then by a holy spirit, and wrote what such a spirit or disposition induced them to believe to be correct. I do not call this inspiration supernatural, but extraordinary. It enabled these holy men to do and to say what they would never have thought, and what none would ever have conceived under any other circumstances whatever. They wrote as they were moved upon by this holy spirit or governing power of their minds. This spirit prevented them from falling into any known or wilful errours, but could not preserve them from all errours, as may be seen from the instances already enumerated. The great mistake of the religious world is in attaching infallibility to this spirit. This has led them to belie their own reason, to deny the testimony of their senses, and to fall into "divers" extravagances in attempting to reconcile contradictions. Admit my views of inspiration, and we can then easily account for the discrepancies which every honest man must admit there is in the bible. They are nothing more than a matter of course. The writers were numerous; they lived in different ages and wrote in different languages, and it would have been singular, indeed, if there could be found no incoherence in their views But Infidels have no right to triumph. Good men, and even wise men, may fall into mistakes; and shall we consider it strange that the sacred writers, though actuated by the best spirit in the universe, have, in discussing so many intricate subjects, committed a few trifling mistakes? Certainly not.

In answer then to the question, is any part of the bible inspired, I have no hesitation to say yes; and if asked what part, the answer is ready. The bible is traditional, historical, moral and doctrinal. The book of Genesis is traditional—it needed no extraordinary inspiration to write that. The historical, including the laws of the Jews, as well as the history of their nation, required no inspiration different in *kind* than what is given to every man. The moral part could be learned from observation. The doctrinal part of the Old Testament is mostly superceded by the new; consequently, I consider as inspired only the doctrinal part of the Christian Scriptures, or of the New-Testament. I have nothing to do with the old, only as it serves to explain or develope the meaning of the new.

AN ESSAY ON DIVINE GOODNESS.

NO. II.

There is no doubt evil in the world. But, because there is evil, I am not disposed to deny there is also good in the world. I detest that sickly disposition, that pitiable state of the brain, that wastes itself in groans and shrieks, which can see nothing but misery, and do nothing but exclaim, "Ah me! how wretched is the world! All is vanity, undeserving a wish or a thought!" The world is valuable. It affords much pleasure, many hours of enjoyment; and doubtless might be made to afford many more. The mountain of human misery may rise before us to impede our path,—We are not to stand trembling at its base, vainly expecting some miracle or some convulsion of nature to remove it. Our industry must surmount it or level it with the plain.

I have said there is evil in the world. No one who can see, hear or feel, can have any doubts of the fact. The only question which ought to occupy our attention is, how can we remove it, or how can we preserve ourselves from its destructive ravages? But mankind are not satisfied with this simple question, nor with the labour it would require them to perform. They have asked, they are impatient to know, how evil came, and how God can be good in admitting it into his system, or in permitting it to remain after once admitted. Wisdom never asked these questions, but since they are asked, wisdom requires us to return the best answer in our power.

"God is good," it is said; how happens it then that there is evil in the world? There is much in the world which appears to us useless or worse than useless, productive of pain, severe in degree, and often long in duration. Can a God of infinite Goodness be the authour of this?

"We make ourselves miserable," it is said. This assertion, with some qualification, is doubtless true. But what are we? Have we any thing we have not received? Whence then the power to make ourselves miserable? From God? What then is the difference? God makes us miserable; he gives us the power to make ourselves miserable? Would the father who loved his child give him the means of destruction? And can it be a proof of goodness in God to give us the means of destroying ourselves? There is no difference whether God makes us miserable directly, or puts into our hands the power, and we, in the exercise of that power, make ourselves miserable. The chain has an additional link; but, in one case as well as in the other, has one end fastened on Deity and the other on man.

But man is not the only being that suffers. The earth is covered—the air and the water are filled with sentient beings. For as our knowledge extends, wherever there is sensation there is pain. The beast, the bird, the fish, the insect, suffer as well as man. Animal feeds on animal through the whole of nature. Man destroys every thing. He tramples upon the insect world, and at every step crushes a multitude of little beings. He takes

the life of larger for his food or his sport, and even of his brother to gratify his avarice, his ambition or his revenge. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain." Is this all owing to man? Some may be, but much he cannot prevent, if indeed he can any. Why was the world subject to this?

"The world is cursed for the transgression of man," say those who dream of nothing but maledictions from God, and whose consciences sting with remorse. But why? Man may have sinned, but why punish the harmless brute? Why doom every grade of being to wretchedness for man's transgression?

Misery may be called the punishment of transgression, but not in every case. Sin, no doubt, brings misery. It would not be sin if it did not. But does sin kindle the subterranean fires, bursting in volcanoes to sweep off thousands of all ages and sexes who are innocent? Does sin produce the earthquake, cause the ground to open, and swallow whole cities in sudden destruction? Is it sin which forbids the ocean to send forth its vapours, the rain to fall, and prevents the earth from yielding its accustomed supply? Does sin wing the pestilence, and carry indiscriminate death to the guilty and to the innocent?

Questions innumerable like these might be asked, but it is useless. Every body knows there is evil in the world. How did it come? Why does a good God allow it to remain?

These are questions which occur to every thinking mind,—questions which create our embarrassment, and often lead us to doubt the goodness of God. Look at the subject once more. Every body must admit that a good Being will not voluntarily produce misery or evil. An Omnipotent Being cannot be compelled to produce it. If God be Omnipotent, and produce it, we have a right to infer he does it voluntarily, from choice. Can he then be good?

Two questions now occur. 1st—Is there evil? 2d—Did God produce it?

The first is already answered in the affirmative. What shall be said to the second? God does either directly or indirectly produce it.—How then is he good?

Two considerations may set this subject in a different light.

1st. The evil which now exists may be the result of an organization, which, notwithstanding it produces this result, will, upon the whole, be the cause of a superiour degree of happiness, sufficient to overbalance the pain which is now suffered.

2d. The present may be considered the infancy of the world, and the evil which we endure is necessarily connected with the imperfect developement of its properties, but may serve, under the present constitution of things, to hasten the period of perfectibility.

1st. In all our reasonings we must, in spite of all our dissatisfaction, take things as they are. We cannot unravel creation, disorganize the universe, scatter the whole to its original chaos, and give directions for its reconstruction. Finite man, weak, erring man, need not presume to soar to the seat of Power Creative, and dictate to the Omniscient rules, by which to arrange the universe. Deity has made it, or it is made, and all we have to do is to make the best of it. Our enquiry now is, has Deity given, in the construction of this system of things, in the organization of matter, in the distribution of animal and intellectual functions, sufficient evidence to warrant the belief that he is benevolent, that he is good to the sentient world.

Evil is of two kinds, moral and physical, or such as flows from the misconduct of moral beings, and such as flows from those parts of nature over which moral beings are supposed to exert little or no control. This distinction may not be very accurate, but it is the one commonly made, and is sufficiently accurate for our purpose.

Only moral evil comes under our first consideration. This class needs examination.—Man is an active being, but he often acts wrong. This acting wrong brings misery.—But the virtuous, or those who obey the laws of God and of man, are miserable, and often the most miserable. Universalists, generally, are tenacious of the position that the most virtuous are the most happy, and the most vicious are the most miserable. This position is doubtless correct when set in its proper light, which is not often done. The reasoning most fashionable on this subject would lead us to conclude, the virtuous man is *always* happy, while the vicious man, on the other hand, is always miserable. The last is true, but the first is false.

Nothing is more evident than that the virtuous do suffer. In all national calamities, there is little distinction between them and the vicious. In the sack and massacres of cities, in the general operations of war, the innocent and the guilty are involved in the same fate. Scripture asserts, and experience fully proves, that when we see a man deeply distressed we are not thence to infer he is a great sinner. Witness the case of Job; no matter whether the history be true or fictitious. The principle it developes is often found in real life.

Mankind are fond of theories. When they get into their heads a favorite theory, they labour to make all facts bend to its support.—The true method is to make theory bend to facts, not facts to theory. It is a fact, the virtuous are often miserable. It is a fact, that a man's apparent suffering afford little evidence of his moral character. Poor consolation indeed it would be, to tell a man racked with pain, suffering under heavy afflictions, that all is a just punishment for his sins.

The true state of the case is this; vice, sin, or transgression, always brings misery to the one who is guilty. But the misery does not stop with the guilty. Its destructive force strikes the virtuous as well as the vicious. The crime generally brings misery upon the head of its authour, and upon those, too, with whom he is connected, whether innocent or guilty.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

FREE ENQUIRERS.

Those who call themselves Orthodox may be sure of our respectful attention, long as we are able to write; but they will pardon us if we leave our examinations of the validity of their claims, to pay our compliments to another class who are making some noise in our little world.

This class is composed of Deists, Scepticks, Free Enquirers, and Materialists. By the by, a friend, more timorous than discerning, whispered in our ear, the other day, that somebody thought the editor of the Gospel Advocate had a strong claim to admission into this honourable corps. Be this as it may, our sentiments are neither the better nor the worse for any supposed coincidence between them and those advocated by the classes we have mentioned. We, however, wish our friends to look at our statements, and if what we alledge for facts be true, they must not censure us, for we cannot make truth bend to their wishes nor to our own. Each one must bend himself to the truth, or else he will always find cause for dissatisfaction. But our readers need not be alarmed. For, before we conclude to dispense with the Gospel—to abjure our Saviour, and relinquish our hope in a future state of existence, we shall change the name of our paper—our friends shall have timely warning.

But it was the Free Enquirers we proposed to notice. How numerous this class may be we cannot say, nor is it of much consequence. The organs of the party, in this country, are the Free Enquirer, lately published at New-Harmony, but now transferred to New-York; the Correspondent published also at New-York, and one or two more publications, we believe, though we have no knowledge of any except these two.

The Free Enquirer is edited by Miss Frances Wright, Robert Dale Owen, and R. L. Jenings. Miss Wright is a lady of talents and of no small philosophical acquisition. Did we believe in transmigration of souls, we might think old Epicurus had re-appeared in the person of Miss Wright, different from what he appeared in the Garden, only in the acquisition of a few feminine graces, and perhaps a few visionary notions, common to both sexes. We mean this as no reproach, for we consider Epicurus best deserving the name of philosopher, of any one antiquity can boast. We were agreeably surprised to find Dr. Good, in his Book of Nature, has not been ashamed to rescue the name of this philosopher from the reproach which has so long deceived the world.

Miss Wright's avowed object is to improve the condition of the human race. This is a good object. We can wish her success in this; for any one who can feel, knows there is need enough. We have seen two of her lectures on knowledge. We approve them, and indeed we have advanced the same principles both in our sermons and our essays. There is nothing in the lectures which should alarm the honest enquirer after truth.

It will, however, be remarked, these lectures are only abstract principles. Perhaps we should differ in our deductions from these principles, and in our application of them to the improvement of the human race. We believe, however, Miss Wright would, in carrying her first principles out in detail, leave man destitute of all religious notions, and deprive him of the benefit of all written laws. Man must have religion. He has always had some kind, and to us there appears nothing better calculated to elevate his conceptions and ennoble his nature, than the religion of Jesus. Written laws, and indeed all government, would be unnecessary, if mankind were just; but whether all can be made so is very doubtful to us. Man is a bundle of appetites and passions, irregular and violent in their operations. Some government will be necessary until his nature is changed, which we think will require more power than the Free Enquirer can exert. And whether the change would make man the better is a matter of doubt. Some things are beautiful in theory, but are the reverse in practice. Miss Wright has a *beau ideal*, perhaps good, but most probably like all ideal beings, better suited to some other world than to this.

Her co-editors, Mr. Owen and Mr. Jennings, we presume, are of the same sentiments with herself. They are men of no mean abilities. Mr. Owen has been the principal acting editor of the Enquirer for some time past. We have read his productions with pleasure. He is a good natured man. Cares little about any man's God or creed; and, what we like him for, he always keeps his temper and manifests a truly catholick spirit. But we should think him blest or curst with too much philosophical indifference, to work any extensive revolution. Men are successful in proportion to their zeal, not to their knowledge. Of Mr. Jennings we know little; some few of his articles we have seen, which elicit some talent.

The Correspondent is edited by George Houston, and is very different in character from the Free Enquirer. The Enquirer may certainly claim the praise of liberality, but the Correspondent, in the rancour of sectarianism, may contest the palm with the most staunch, thorough-going orthodox publications of the day. Mr. Houston will pardon our freedom, but we think if he cannot exhibit as powerful arguments as religionists, he can match them in virulence. And if he does not believe the orthodox creed, he seems not much deficient in its spirit.

Fools and knaves, dupes and impostors, are the charitable epithets he heaps upon us poor creatures, who are so old fashioned as to believe the bible. Alas for the believer in the bible! he can expect no mercy at the hands of the relentless editor. We have

have sometimes thought if the spirit which breathes in his paper should become predominant, that we foolish creatures who cling to the religion of Jesus, would be put to death, merely that the land might be purged of the enemies to his beautiful theory. Though upon second thought we conclude it would be like the spirit of all sects when in power, treat kindly all who submit. Mr. Houston has suffered imprisonment for his sentiments. He, no doubt, feels acutely. We would make all allowances necessary. But we do think one precept from that book he despises would be comfortable to his feelings. It is the precept which requires us to forgive our enemies.

The sentiments of this paper are such as are held by modern Deists, or, perhaps Materialists;—we have not read the paper attentively. The value of such sentiments have been pretty well tested. We are not very sure they will be useful to the world. We do not, however, deny the editors of these papers the right to circulate their sentiments. They have the same right we have to circulate ours. But still we do not perceive their peculiar worth.

Both these papers attack religion. If they hurled their blows at superstition only, it would be well. It may be the result of education, it may be folly; but we have found religion very comfortable to our feelings. When we were overwhelmed with adversity, (and we have been) it was not a little consoling to reflect the world is under the control of a wise, powerful and good Being, who will cause all things to work together for good, and that our light affliction here, will work for us a far more exceeding weight of glory.

We are opposed to superstition, to bigotry, and to false systems of religion. But we have not yet become so *enlightened* as to be pleased with universal scepticism, or with the cold unfeeling dreams of the Deist, or colder speculations of the Materialist. Creation loses its beauty, the world its charms, when we consider it the fortuitous production of chance or of blind necessity. And then, to think we live, toil a few days, sink into the grave and are no more, is not well calculated to prompt exertion, or to keep up our spirits amid the numerous incidents of life.

But if these editors will convince us (and we are willing to be convinced) that their course is calculated to regenerate the world, and make man universally happy, they may then have our good wishes and our co-operation. They go too fast for us. We condemn them not, but would say, the progress of truth is always slow, and they, in our opinion, far outstrip her in the race.—EDITOR.

BAPTISM.

In the last volume was commenced, between Mr. Everett and Mr. A. Rains, a controversy on this subject, which on the part of Mr. Rains has been continued in the present volume. It was expected Mr. Everett would reply to Mr. R., but he informs us, the many duties he has to discharge in his new situation together with ill health, prevent him from bearing his part of the discussion. We regret this circumstance, not only because we are averse from controversies of this nature, but also because we are deprived of Br. Everett's biblical talents which would do more ample justice to the subject than we can hope to perform ourself. But at the request of Mr. Everett and that Mr. R. may have no reason to complain of being neglected, we offer some few remarks.

The origin of the controversy is well enough known to the readers of the Advocate. Mr. Rains was formerly a Universalist preacher. But renounced it, and went to preaching immersion. Some of our friends in Ohio were grieved and requested Mr. Everett to discuss the subject. He made some remarks, which drew a reply from Mr. Rains, &c.

Mr. Rains has given us *fair warning* that he will not be called a "Campbellite." We let it pass. We have no wish to dispute about names, though names often have a mighty magick. The question in debate, if we understand it, is simply this, is water baptism obligatory on Christians? or, is water baptism essential to the Christian character?

This is easily decided. What constitutes a Christian? If we can understand the precepts of Christ, the whole may be summed up in these two positions: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. and thy neighbour as thyself. Christianity looks at the heart, not at outward ceremonies. When it has produced in the heart love to God and benevolence to man, its object is accomplished. To us it is a matter of indifference *how* this love be produced if it only be produced. If being put all over under water will make one love his God or his neighbour more, let him be "dipped," by all means, and as often as dipping is found to have a salutary effect.

The fruits of religion, or the effect which is produced by this love in the heart, is to visit the fatherless and the widows in their afflictions and to keep oneself unspotted from the world or the vices of the world.—That is, to be active in works beneficial to others, and to restrain ourselves from whatever is injurious. This we call Christianity. This love and this effect is essential to the Christian character, and, we believe, all that is essential. If water baptism lead to this result we have no objections to it, but this we very much doubt. It is a ceremony—it is at best but a shadow, and though a shadow may sometimes lead to the substance, it more generally has an opposite effect. People who are baptized are apt to think they have done some great thing for which God will love them a great deal better. And, what is worst of all, people generally hate their brethren in the same proportion as they believe God has a *distinguished* love for themselves.

Mr. R.'s premises are objectionable. He says Christ is a Lawgiver. He has commanded us to be baptized, therefore, (right or wrong I suppose,) we must obey. Supposing Christ had commanded us as we expected his favour, to spend our lives in puffing with our breath against the wind, would Mr. R. think himself bound to obey? We think not. We care nothing about the letter of Christ's commands, if we are able to comply with the spirit or intention of his commands, it satisfies us. "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life."

It is *our* practice to look at the commands of Christ,

to satisfy ourselves as it respects the occasion on which they were given, or the reason why they were couched in the terms they are, and then to ascertain what it is they require of us. But let this principle pass. We will take Mr. R. on his ground. We deny that Christ has ever commanded us to baptize or be baptized.—True he commanded his Apostles to baptize. But we are not Apostles, consequently the command was not given to us. The Apostles never gave a single precept to their followers to baptize, or at least we know no such precept. Commands must be strictly construed according to Mr. Rains' mode of reasoning. Let them be so—abide the letter of the command, and produce a single command which declares baptism a perpetual ordinance, and we will grant it binding—or indeed one which declares it essential to the Christian character. The example of the Apostles is no guide for us. We are no Apostles. The Apostles circumcised, shall we circumcise? But enough. If Mr. Rains is not satisfied, we will meet him on the reason or utility of the ordinance; or, if he dislikes the ground of our reasoning, we pledge ourselves to prove it correct against whatever he may offer.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

We make no apology for publishing the following "Address" and "Letters," though the subject is rather local in its character. Mr. Stow's letter breathes the true spirit of orthodoxy. It is proud, arogant, and all-sufficient; and we are well ploased with the severe but just castigation he has received from Mr. Badger. If he is not past amendment, this castigation may teach him better manners, and learn him to treat people with civility. We have heard much of the overbearing conduct of this Calvinistick Divine, and are glad he is now told of his fault. Had his teachers done their duty he might have been spared the humiliation he must now feel, if indeed he be not, as we fear, lost to all sense of shame.

Mr. Badger is not a Universalist, but no matter for that. He advocates the rights of conscience and is willing to grant to others what he claims for himself. This is enough. We ask no more of any one. Mr. B.'s views of the personage of Christ are different from ours. We think he still retains too much mystery. He adopts what has been called the Homoiousion doctrine, that Christ is not of the same, but of a similar substance with the Father. We have no skill in these niceties. Perhaps he is right. This view of Christ will be fully discussed in the progress of our "Essay on Christianity."

Mr. B. thinks the flesh of Christ went to heaven, and that *that which died on the cross*, will be worshipped there. We are not yet convinced of the correctness of this position. We should like to have Mr. B. develope his views more largely on this point, for we are of the opinion, that God alone is worshipped in heaven. We consider Christ as a mere instrument in the hands of the Father to effect the reconciliation of the world. We may be mistaken. We would not be dogmatick. Let every one judge for himself. Ed.

MR. BADGER AND MR. STOW'S LETTERS.

MR. BADGER'S ADDRESS,

Delivered to a congregation in Elbridge, on the subject of his correspondence with Mr. Stow, March 6, 1829.

My Friends:

An unfortunate affair a few days since happened betwixt me and one of the clergymen of this village, which has produced no small stir, and has drawn forth remarks and observations from almost all classes of society. At length it becomes my duty to speak to the publick on the subject, and circumstances forbid my longer silence. Amidst the commotion of the times, I have the pleasure of reflecting, that I have not commenced any subject of contention with Mr. Stow nor any other man in this land. I have passed your streets—visited my friends and attended my appointments as a peaceable citizen should do. When I was called to the afflicted family of Mr. Curtis to preach at the funeral of their son, (a circumstance which I can never name but with the deepest emotions) I thought myself in the honest and faithful discharge of my duty towards God and man; little did I think that from the best pulpit in the place, and from a man whom I had never seen, I should receive such a bitter and cruel assault.

I immediately addressed a friendly note to Mr. Stow, being assured by several of his friends, that he would make an honourable retraction, but no apology is made. When I received his answer to my note, I wrote him again lengthy, upon the circumstances and upon the contents of his letter, to which he did not reply. But I received a message from several persons, that he wished me to visit him; but as my confidence in his honour had become shaken, and as I could see no good reason why I should go to him, I was confident that a private interview would be unsafe, as our conversation might be misrepresented. I therefore did not call. Had Mr. S. sent a note expressing the object of an interview, I should not have declined. I then addressed him another letter which was short but positive: soon after I was informed that if I would write my opinion upon the character of Christ, he would read my letter to his assembly, and would make all necessary acknowledgement; being urged much on this subject I consented, which communication was presented last Saturday by Deac. Cox, who is present, which, after Mr. S. had looked over without making objection to any part of it, said to Mr. Cox, "I will read it to-morrow." Last Sabbath morning, before the Sabbath School was out, just as the people were coming in, he read (at that confused moment) *a part of it*, leaving out the *beginning, end* and *all* the *important quotations;* and then commenced a lengthy harrangue, in which he attempted to

justify himself, reprobate my doctrine and burlesque my language. In one place he paused and said, he should like to see the scripture which proved that *Christ's body* or the *lamb slain*, was worshipped in heaven, when the scripture which proved it was referred to in the very line he was reading, which he neglected to read to the assembly. Was this fair? was it honest? was it decent?

Again, he ridicules my statement which says, we are not required by the gospel to believe any thing which is not tangible to our senses." In this place in my letter I am speaking upon the subject of revelation which comprises three things: 1st. the *Scripture*. 2nd. the *Gospel*. 3rd. the influence of the *Holy Spirit*. Do we not *see* the scriptures? Do we not *hear* the gospel? Do we not *feel* the Spirit? And has not man internal as well as external senses, I insist on the correctness of my statement, it is just—and will bear the closest investigation. Religion is a rational and reasonable subject, and the doctrine of the Trinity is, as I said, "contrary to all rational principles of reason."

He also stated that I believed that Christ is *a created Being*, what authority had he to say this? there is no such thing intimated in any of my letters; this I consider is like the first assault, a wicked, false and mischievous misrepresentation. Perhaps he would say in this case as he did in the first, that he "SUPPOSED" that I adopted the views of Mr. GREW. His imagination must be very fertile, and his conscience can stretch to almost any length or shape. And what can we think of his veracity, if he positively promised Mr. Cox to read that letter, and then leaves out important and essential parts of it; I leave this intelligent community to judge, and I leave him to suffer the miseries of a guilty conscience, and the indignation which his superstition, pride and egotism merit from the rising generation.

The foregoing is a true account of the manner in which Mr. Stow treated my letter, as I have been informed by several respectable citizens who heard his remarks last Sabbath. As there are several persons present who heard him, I will thank either of you to correct me if you find me in any mistake. But what shall be done under present circumstances? I think it my duty (and the cause of Christian liberty demands it) to do two things. 1st. To publish all the letters which have passed betwixt us, together with this address, that the publick may have a fair understanding of the merits of the case. 2nd. As my opinions have been misrepresented relative to the character of Christ, I will preach a sermon in this village on that subject, and wish my friends to request the use of one of the meeting-houses for that purpose, and in case they are denied, it will be preached at this house. I shall preach here next Sabbath evening, at which time the appointment will be given. I most sincerely hope that this method of proceeding will wake up the *slumbering strength* of Mr. S. and call him forth in his defence, that we may have a more perfect specimen of his masculine powers and boasted errudition.

MR. BADGER'S NOTE TO MR. STOW.

"Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake.—JESUS.

Elbridge, Onondaga co. N. Y. Jan. 14, 1829.

Rev. Mr. Stow—Sir:

I am informed by members of your Congregation, that on the 4th inst. when you gave the appointment for me to preach at the Baptist meeting house, at the funeral of Mr. Curtis, you informed your people that "MR. BADGER DENIED THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST," and I take this friendly method to state to you that your testimony on this occasion, is incorrect, and you, as a gentleman, Christian and minister, are in duty bound to correct it. I therefore ask you to read this note in publick meeting, and make your apology to your congregation, which is the method to prevent farther dissatisfaction and trouble.

I wish to live on good terms with ministers of all denominations, and am not willing to slander the character nor misrepresent the opinions of any; and it is with great reluctance that I ever enter the field of controversy, but wish peaceably to attend to the congregations of my charge. But Sir, your assault is so publick and your slander so cruel and unprovoked, that it demands notice.

I have sustained the character of a minister of the gospel sixteen years, and have ever preached and firmly believed in the DIVINITY OF CHRIST. I believe Christ is *divine*, 1st in *origin*, for he came from God; 2d, in *nature;* 3rd, in *work*, for his work is to conquer death and make men immortal; 4th, in *titles*, for his name shall be called the mighty God, &c. 5th, He is an object of divine adoration, for the angels are commanded to worship him; and finally I believe all that the scriptures say of *Him* and dare not *add* nor *diminish*. But the *creeds of men I abominate;* the doctrines of men I cheerfully dissent from, and am a decided hater of priestcraft and all the pious fraud of the clergy, who have long attempted to lord it over the consciences of men.

If you are disposed to make a reply to this hasty note, please to leave your answer at the postoffice in this village within ten days.

I am, sir, very respectfully yours,
JOSEPH BADGER.

REV. MR. STOW, *Elbridge.*

ELBRIDGE, 16TH JANUARY, 1829.

Elder Badger—Sir:

I received a note from you yesterday, wishing me to recall an assertion that I made in the pulpit respecting your religious sentiments.

It would give me pleasure, sir, to know that you are a firm believer in the true and essential Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and when I am convinced of this, I will make the apology you ask. I was informed that you was a preacher of the Christian denomination, and supposed you adopted the views of Henry Grew, respecting our Saviour. If I am mistaken, I am willing to be corrected. In relation to your views of Christ, I supposed that I understood your sentiments before your letter come to hand, nor has your statements satisfied me I was incorrect. But. that there should be no mistake, I wish to ask you a few plain questions, which, if satisfactorily answered, will enable me to determine whether I ought to make an apology or not. You say, that you believe Christ to be Divine, 1st, in origin. Do you mean by this, sir, that he is uncreated and eternal *in the same sense that the Father is? Say yes or no.* When in the 2nd place you say that he is Divine in nature, do you mean that what constitutes the Father God, in essence, makes the Son God also? *Say yes or no.* When in the 3d place you say that he is Divine in his works, do you mean that he has essentially the same *underived power* that the Father has, for creating and governing all things? *Say yes or no.* When you say that he is Divine in titles do you mean that the words Lord, God, Mighty God, Jehovah, &c. are to be applied to him in the *very same high sense they are applied to the Father? Say yes or no.* When you say that he is Divine because he is an object of Divine adoration, do you mean that we are to adore him *in the same high sense that we are the Father? Say yes or no.* If Mr. Badger can answer *all* these questions in the affirmative, I will most cheerfully retract what I uttered in the pulpit respecting your sentiments. I do not wish Mr. B. to enter into explanations that may evade the questions which I have put; but I wish the plain yes or no to be given to each one of them, and nothing more. It is expected that your answer will close the correspondence, by being so plain, and so much to the point, as to leave no room for mistake. With respect to Mr. B's private character, I have said nothing unfavorable. I merely spoke of your religious sentiments, and if mistaken, you can set me right, by plainly answering questions with a yes or no. I should rejoice to know that your views of Christ coincide with mine. Yours, respectfully,

TIMOTHY STOW.

Elder Joseph Badger.

P. S. If Mr. B. makes explanations to evade a *direct* answer to my questions, he must not expect me to take *any* notice of his letter.

T. S.

MR. BADGER TO MR. STOW.—No. 2.

"*Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh he to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.*"—Jesus.

Auburn, Feb. 7, 1829.

Rev. Mr Stow—Sir:

I have received your letter of the 16th ult. in answer to my note of the 14th, and am sorry I have succeeded no better in convincing you that I am a believer in the divinity of Christ. And indeed sir, your letter causes me almost to despair of accomplishing an object so desirable. I had been encouraged by the favourable account some of your hearers had given me of your piety and moral rectitude, to think that if you had done me injustice it was unintentionally, and that you would readily retract it on receiving suitable information on the subject. I therefore, with the advice of my friends and some of yours, addressed to you the note in which I made the full and unequivocal declaration that I had ever preached and firmly believed in the divinity of Christ, and that I believe all the scriptures say of him, and dare not add nor diminish. I thought this sufficient to satisfy any rational and candid man. My testimony, sir, is that which will be taken before any court of justice, and that which has never been disputed among my neighbours, nor before any ecclesiastical body to my knowledge. But sir, you politely say, "Nor have your statements satisfied me that I was incorrect." Now you have made a publick declaration that I deny the "*divinity of Christ.*" I, in a friendly manner, inform you that I do not; then what is your reply but a plain contradiction of my word? and is it not the same as to say, you think my testimony false? How do you suppose a man of feelings and fidelity feels on receiving a letter from a gentleman of your profession and high standing which plainly gives him the lie? And what sort of power is this which you arrogate to yourself by which you presume to know my sentiments better than I know them? I think you have never seen my face, nor heard me speak, yet you know all about my opinions, and when I inform you that you are mistaken, you plainly tell me that you do not believe what I say.

I am willing to affirm before any legal authority, that I believe the precious Saviour is a divine being, according to the import of the word in the English language, and that I believe all the scriptures say of him, and what can you ask more? But when we go beyond the scriptures and leave the common import of the word divine in our language, no doubt my opinion might differ from yours; hence arises the principle part of divisions and difficulties among Christians on important points in theology. The word divine I should explain by the scriptures and our language, you would probably wish to explain it by *your creed;* hence the difference I imagine might be considerable. But shall we anathamatize each other as hereticks, and defame each other in publick? or

shall we give to others the liberty we wish to enjoy ourselves?

You say that you was informed that I was a preacher of the Christian denomination, and that you "*supposed*" that I adopted the views of Henry Grew respecting our Saviour. This is the only apology you offer for your assertion. Then *supposition* is the only ground on which you have formed your opinion of me. Mr. GREW is a man I highly esteem as a man of talents, and I know of no man who has a purer spirit and life; but he is not and never was a member of the Christian connexion; and what reason have you to *suppose Mr. Grew* to be my model as to theology? Would it not have been more consistent with your *supposition* to have said, (if you are satisfied of the fact,) that Mr. Grew, of Hartford, Conn. denied the divinity of Christ? But this would not have fixed the prejudice of your people on me, and of course it would not so well answer your purpose.

As to my being one of the sect which is every where spoken against, it is true; but you do not pretend to any knowledge of their sentiments, but *suppose* they adopt the opinions of Mr. Grew. Is not this rather a loose and careless way of judging upon the opinions of your neighbours? Is this doing to others as you would have them do by you? Would you not think me ungenerous to proclaim as a fact in publick, that you was an Atheist and denied the existence of a God? and when I was informed to the contrary, I render as a reason that I "*supposed*" you adopted the views of VOLNEY. This work of *supposing* what the opinions of others are, without legal information, and then to proclaim our *suppositions* for truth, is as cruel as the *tender mercies of the wicked.* But there was no SUPPOSE SO, when you gave my appointment—there was no HEARSAY in that case. Why did you not tell your congregation that what you was about to say concerning Mr. B. was all founded upon *supposition* and *hearsay*? and that you had never seen him, and knew nothing of his sentiments? When you become acquainted with the people called Christians you will find among them many good orthodox members. Our fellowship is not founded on particular tenets and speculative opinions, but upon the cardinal virtues of the heart and rectitude of life; and we think every man's opinion his own private property, and the only proper ground of Christian fellowship is spirit and practice.

At the close of your letter you say, "I should rejoice to know that your views of Christ coincide with mine." What if they do not? Is this a proof that I deny the divinity of Christ? Are all that dissent from you hereticks? Are you the standard and oracle by which the Christian world are to be judged? Are you authorized to denounce in publick all who cannot pronounce your favourite *Shibboleth*? If I will cry, *great is Diana*, eat bread in the *Idol's temple*, and say shibboleth, you will as you say most cheerfully retract. Is not this a strange way to get rid of an act of justice which you owe to your people, your conscience and your God? Supposing I should slander you and then say, Mr. S. if you will say you are a disciple of Mahomet, "I will most cheerfully retract," would this satisfy you? I think you would look upon it as a piece of deception.

I suppose, sir, that you cannot be ignorant that you have trampled upon the laws of your God and your country. The law of God says, "speak evil of no man," and should you be called to the bar of your country to answer for the crime of slander, what could you say? I think you would be found speechless, for the new constitution of this state says, in cases of slander, "the defendant must prove the truth of his assertion, and that it was said out of good motive." Your assertion, sir, is *untrue*, and your motive was to excite prejudice against a peaceable man who has done you no harm. The same spirit which dictated you in this case, I have no doubt, would burn me with a slow fire as it did MICHAEL SERVETUS, was it not for the laws of this happy land. But here, thank God, we have the liberty of conscience, for church and state are not yet yoked together, though many attempts have been made to effect this great object.

Relative to your five questions to which you require me to say—"YES OR NO," and forbid my giving any explanation of the doctrine contained in them, I do not think myself under any obligation to answer your questions under these very rigid restrictions. What authority have you to mark out the precise words of my answer? Seven times in one short letter you have written the words that I must use, and commanded me to say "YES OR NO;" twice you forbid my entering into any explanation, and once you say you want "YES OR NO and nothing more." My dear sir, I am sorry you manifest so much alarm, and that you so much dread an explanation. If your doctrine is true, be assured it will suffer nothing by investigation.

But to bring this matter to a close, I stand aggrieved with you and think you guilty of misrepresenting my opinions, or in other words, of the crime of slander. This slander was unprovoked and uncalled for. The people at Elbridge and vicinity I have addressed occasionally for twelve years. They are much better acquainted with my sentiments than you appear to be. Again, it was a funeral occasion. The sudden and shocking death of Mr. Curtis, had excited the attention of the whole community. The Baptist meeting-house was opened in a friendly manner. I was the choice of the afflicted family to address them on this painful occasion. The young man and family had mingled in my congregations for many years, even long before you was known as a preacher, and surely they

had a right to choose their own minister. How do you suppose the bleeding hearts of your near neighbours felt, when they were informed of the disrespect with which you treated them on this occasion. Your slander under other circumstances, would not have appeared in so aggravated a character nor have produced so general a murmur among the people. As to the words used, had you have said Mr. B. is an *anti-trinitarian*, or Mr. B. is a *Unitarian*, (tho' I do not take that name,) you never would have heard of a complaint from me.

Now sir, if you please I will submit the difficulty betwixt us to three disinterested men of your own choice, or to the male members of your congregation. If after hearing my charge and your defence, and they have duly investigated the subject they say I have no cause of grief, I will make a very low bow to *you* and *them* and retire in peace. If they decide that you have transgressed the rules of common decency, you shall make an apology to your congregation.—This is all that I have ever asked of you.

With these remarks and proposals, I have done with this subject until I hear from you, or am convinced that you intend to treat this epistle with neglect.

I am, sir, very respectfully yours,
J. BADGER.

REV. TIMOTHY STOW, Elbridge.

P. S. Leave an answer to this, if you please, at your post-office. J. B.

(To be continued.)

PROGRESS OF TRUTH.

The signs of the times are encouraging. Though a thousand things may conspire to arrest the progress of Truth, or to divert its course, still the movements of the day augur favourably to suffering humanity. Orthodoxy, poor creature, is making her last desperate effort. New-England is nearly revolutionized. Our eastern bigots are discomfited in the land of "steady habits;" and though they are pouring in upon us at the west, we can assure them no warm reception. We have had our eyes bandaged, but they are now opened—at least, so that we can "see men as trees walking." The impatience of Orthodoxy has overcome her prudence. She has exhibited her haggard features—features which, "to be hated, need but to be seen."

Alas for the champion of Orthodoxy! Poor Br. Beecher. How are the mighty fallen! Where are this man's lectures against Universalism, of which we heard so much? We heard he "ground the argument of Universalists all to powder." It must have been a tremendous display." Why does the Doctor refuse to publish them? Poor man, he seems sorely cast down. He is called upon by friends and by foes to answer for himself, but seems silent as death.

By the by, what can be the matter with our Theological Seminary in this village? A powerful Universalist Society is growing up here before their eyes.—Cayuga county disdains orthodoxy; and the sentiments of John Calvin have but a few retreats here and the faculty and students are silent as the house of death. They have even lost their love of money and almost their regard for the souls of the Heathen.—Somebody said twelve and a half dollars would save a Heathen's soul. We have offered the students twenty dollars, for the best written essay against Universalism, with the promise to publish it, which might be the means of saving many souls; but they are still.—Their countenances are sad, they look "chap-fallen"—grave as a church-yard on the eve of a burial, whenever we chance to meet them. Are they struck with consternation, or lost in some stupifying dream? Ah, well may they look grave! They are learning a trade which in a few years will be useless. They will then have to beg or to take some honest calling for a livelihood.

Our eastern papers bring us cheering intelligence. Ministers are constantly deserting the limitarian ranks. Two we mention—Mr. De Wolf and Mr. Chapin, from the Methodists, have entered the ranks of the liberals. This is as it should be. Let the work go on. Man may yet learn to love his brother, and put confidence in God.

We thank the editor of the Religious Inquirer for the notice he has taken of the Gospel Advocate. We are flattered with his request for our articles on the "cause of evil," but must assure him we have never published a series of articles on that subject. We published in the last year's volume of the Advocate a series of articles under the head of "Essayist," but these were not much connected in their subjects. The seventh No. was on the "cause of evil," and this perhaps being the one he has received, is the reason of his concluding the whole were on that subject. The Essay on Divine Goodness, which is now publishing, the second number of which may be found in this No. of our paper, is intended to give that subject—the cause of evil a full discussion.

Our readers will be pleased with the very excellent Sermon, from Br. Everett, former editor of the Advocate. The authour will excuse us for not inserting it earlier than this number, for the very excellent sermon from Br. Curtis, published in our last, was in the hands of the compositor when his was received. Another sermon from Br. Everett, is received and will appear in No. 8. We are thankful for such favours, and hope our highly esteemed brother in the faith will continue them.

NOTICE.

All persons indebted to the 5th volume of the Gospel Advocate, (published in 1827,) are requested to remit the amount due, to U. F. DOUBLEDAY, Auburn, N. Y. or, if more convenient, to the Subscriber at Watertown, Jefferson county, N. Y. If payment is promptly made, two dollars will be accepted from each subscriber, THEODORE TUTTLE,

Administrator of the Estate of the late Gershom Tuttle, deceased.

Poetick Department.

SELECTED FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

Ye speak of *Friendship* as a gift bestowed
To every being by the hand of God,
A *natural* flame, which glows in every breast—
A *common* thing, by all alike possessed.
Whilst fortune *smiles* and *plenty* fills your board—
Whilst copious draughts your cheering vaults afford;
Whilst rosy *health* supports the human frame;
Whilst *credit* lasts, and whilst exists your fame;
Whilst you have plenty, and whilst cash to spend,
So long you're known—so long you have a friend!
But change the scene—let sickly fortune *frown*,
You stand forsaken, and, alas, unknown!
Let wretched *poverty* and *hunger* press;
Let *want* hang out the ensign of distress;
Let sore affliction sink thy feeble frame;
Let cruel Slander wound thy honest fame;
Let neighbors slight thee, and let *credit* fail;
Let sheriffs come and creditors assail;
Where's then thy *Friend?* Alas! you search in vain,
Self-interest sways—unheeded you complain!
Alas! how oft, in *Friendship's* garb arrayed,
Deception triumphs—hapless man's betrayed!
Pretended Friends in every clime abound;
But *real friends* are "rare as comets" found.
Ye who pretend the human heart to know,
Show me a FRIEND, and I'll an ANGEL show!

From the New England Palladium.

MARY'S TEARS.

When the repentant Mary came,
And knelt at Jesus' feet,
Weighed down by sorrow, sin and shame,
And poured the precious sweet—

The tears of penitence bedewed
The humble mourner's eye;
Her contrite grief, her maker view'd,
And registered on high.

She, at her Saviour's footstool, bent,
And humbly knelt to pray;
God saw her heart—forgiveness sent—
And wiped her sins away.

Ye who by sin have been misled
From the bright way to Heaven,
And would again its pathway tread,
And wish to be forgiven—

Do not upon the sacred shrine,
Your glittering off'rings heap,
As if your gems were things divine—
But like the suppliant weep.

O! may the storms of sorrow raise
Your wandering thoughts to Heaven;
May you, like Mary, kneel and praise,
Like Mary—be forgiven.

LIFE'S SUNNY SPOTS.

BY W. LEGGETT.

Though life's a dark and thorny path,
Its goal the silent tomb,
It yet some spots of sunshine hath,
That smile amidst the gloom,
The friend who weal and woe partakes,
Unchanged whate'er our lot,
Who kindly soothes the heart that aches—
Is sure a sunny spot.

The wife who half our burden bears,
And utters not a moan;
Whose ready hand wipes off our tears,
Unheeded all her own;
Who treasures every kindly word,
Each harsher one forgot,
And carols lightly as a bird—
She's too, a sunny spot.

The child who lifts, at morn and eve,
In prayer its tiny voice:
Who grives whene'er its parent's grieve,
And joys when they rejoice;
In whose bright eye young genius glows,
Whose heart without a blot,
Is fresh and pure as summer's rose—
That childs's a sunny spot.

There's yet upon life's weary road,
One spot of brighter glow,
Where sorrow half forgets its load,
And tears no longer flow:
Friendship may wither, love decline,
Our child dishonor blot;
But still undim'd that spot will shine—
Religion lights that spot.

THE DYING MOTHER.

"She made a sign
To bring her babe—'twas brought and by her plac'd;
She looked upon its face that neither smiled
Nor wept, nor knew who gazed upon't, and laid
Her hand upon its little breast, and sought
For it with look that seemed to penetrate
The heaven—unutterable blessings, such
As God to dying parents only granted,
For infants left behind them in the world.
"God keep my child," we heard her say, and heard
No more, the Angel of the Covenant
Was come, and faithful to his promise stood
Prepared to walk with her thro' death's dark vale.
And now her eyes grew bright, and brighter still,
Too bright for ours to look upon, suffused
With many tears, and closed without a cloud
They set as sets the morning star, which goes
Not down behind the darkened west, nor hides
Obscured among the tempests of the sky,
But melts away into the light of heaven."

TO MY LITTLE SISTER.

Thou art lively and laughing now
And joy illumes thy little face;
Will sorrow never bathe thy brow
Nor joy to misery give place?

Yes, thou wilt find that this vain world
Is filled with sorrow and deceit—
And thou to misery may'st be hurl'd,
Long ere thy heart has ceased to beat.

Could a brother's fervent prayer,
The least avail thy future weal,
Thy mediator would be there,
When at the throne of grace I kneel.

Oh, sorrowful may be thy doom,
Withered all thy hopes and love;
Then turn thee from this world of gloom,
And meekly raise thine eyes above—

Thy Maker and thy God is there,
And when thou find'st no joy on earth,
He will hear the orphan's prayer
Give thee bliss of heavenly birth.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1829. [NO. 7.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON

ON THE REFUGE OF LIES.

Delivered at Auburn, N. Y. on the third Sabbath in February, 1829.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

"Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death and with hell are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us; for we have made lies our refuge and under falsehood have we hid ourselves."—Isaiah xxviii. 15.

Such is the condition of man, that he is constantly looking to some shelter from the adverse storms, which he is compelled to buffet and to some refuge from the numerous host of external and internal enemies with which he is surrounded. He seldom has that confidence in himself, or that reliance on Divine protection, which is requisite to overcome the evils of life, consequently it becomes the great business of his life to seek the desired aid from the fertility of his inventions.

Whenever we cast our eyes over human society and mark the various pursuits of its members, the hopes and fears which by turns possess their bosoms, the disappointments which attend their labours and the dissatisfaction which follows their acquisitions, we cannot fail to perceive much misery, and not a little cause for uneasiness in the condition of our brethren. We are not then to be surprized to discover numerous inventions which the ingenuity of men, sharpened by a painful sense of their wants, has sought out to lessen their uneasiness and increase their enjoyments. And when we take into consideratiou the mental darkness which afflicts even the most enlightened, we are not to wonder that so many of these inventions are of little use to the inventors.

The mind of man is a bundle of strange and heterogenous qualities, and is constantly changing its desires and its convictions of what will afford the wished enjoyment. When we have surveyed the earth, culled its flowers and extracted its sweets, we seem little nearer the desired good than when we commenced our labours. Every thing seems to tire when it is examined, and to disgust when it has lost the charm of novelty. When we have run, or when we suppose we have run, the whole routine of earthly delights, we cast our eyes to another world, and imagine it filled with a thousand things, pleasing or painful, as hope or fear predominates in the mind. Though our situation here has many bright and sunny spots, yet the painful scenes through which we pass, leave the most vivid impression, and indeed almost obliterate the recollection of every thing pleasing. Hence, fear generally predominates in our minds whenever we attempt to pull aside the veil and look at the world beyond the precincts of sense. We feel more the dread of misery than we do the hope of felicity. We thus come to look upon death as an enemy, whom it is important to reconcile, and hell or the region of the wretched, as a being with whom it would be dangerous to have any dispute.

The object of inquiry becomes changed.—The ever-busy mind employs its inventive faculties to discover means by which it can so far conciliate the affections of death and hell, that it may flatter itself they will not oppose its felicity or prevent it from gaining those seats or that rank and character, in the invisible world which it is fancied will be supremely conducive to satisfying that longing desire for happiness which now racks the heart with so many painful emotions. A covenant is therefore made with death and the mind fancies itself at agreement with hell.

Perhaps it will not be unpleasant nor wholly unprofitable to spend a few moments in considering the covenant which many make with death, their agreement with hell, and their refuge of lies which they imagine will protect them from the overfloweing scourge.

I do not enter on the enquiry concerning the refuge of lies, to which many of my brethren have fled, with any exultation, because I think I shall discover those who differ from me to be erroneous in their opinions. A man who has the least claim to philanthropick feelings should be above such a disposition—a disposition which none but bigots can indulge. But it is important to the acquisition of truth that we detect errour; and it is a well substantiated fact that we cannot enlighten the mind until we have pointed out its errours. We must remove the rubbish which has been accumulating during a hundred centuries, before we lay the foundation for the temple of truth. I am as much pleased when I detect an errour as I am when I discover a new truth. When we have detected our errour, we are in a fair

way to abandon it, and to prepare the mind for the reception of the truth. I make these remarks, because it is frequently said, we must confine ourselves to the delineation of our own sentiments, regardless of the errours and false reasoning of others. This remark generally discloses more goodness of heart than correctness of thought, and if obeyed, would require us to cast our pearls before swine and to give that which is holy unto dogs, a mode of proceeding not recommended by our Saviour after whom we should pattern.

In prosecuting our subject, we shall consider, who those are that make a covenant with death and hell and have sought a refuge of lies to hide them from the overflowing scourge; the consequences of their covenant and refuge, and the probability of their permanency. The prophet Isaiah, as we learn from the context, addressed himself in the words we have selected, to the scornful men of Jerusalem; and he describes the situation of the Jewish people at the time the Messiah should come.—Historical aid may then be used to elucidate prophecy. An acquaintance with the character, conduct and opinions of the House of Israel at the coming of Christ, will exhibit the peculiar features of the persons after whom we are enquiring, and enable us to distinguish them among the present generation.

The Jews, though esteeming themselves righteous, had become exceedingly corrupt. Divided into factions, all parties seemed deaf to the voice of reason, dead to all genuine religious feelings, disgraced by an overweening attachment to their own opinions, and degraded by a puerile and often destructive superstition. Their government had lost its force, and little discernment was necessary to perceive that the state stood on the brink of ruin; that the least convulsions from within, or the smallest pressure from without, would be enough to send it over the precipice to complete destruction. But when reproved for their vices and admonished of the pernicious tendency of their conduct, they turned away replying with scorn, "We have made a covenant with death and at hell are we at agreement." They considered themselves the chosen people of God; they fancied him under obligations to protect their nation and their religion; and they concluded their rites and ceremonies—their "divers washings"—their oblations of "mint, anise and cummin," would sufficiently atone for their neglect of justice and mercy, of love to God, or of benevolence to man. Were they threatened with death or with punishment, they imagined death must be satisfied with the Gentiles, and concluded that their agreement with hell would be preserved by consigning all but themselves to its power.

These few marks will designate clearly enough, who those are, who now make a covenant with death and are at agreement with hell. They were formerly the *religious* people, or those who made great pretences to piety and uncommon holiness. This is the class that now adopt the same caution. The religious people of this age—I mean those who boast of their religion, and proclaim their piety and benevolence through the medium of publick journals—these are the ones who may come under the description of the prophet and claim the honour of the covenant and agreement of which he speaks.

The correctness of this remark will be clearly evinced, if we just glance at some of the sentiments, which this class consider fundamental to their creed.

They tell us, the soul that sinneth shall die. They confess themselves sinners—say they sin at every breath and are deserving to die. But do they expect to die the death here intended? By no means. They have made a covenant with death in which, they on their part, stipulate to give him all the heathen and all who do not adopt their creed; and death accepts the stipulation and promises them a release. These people, orthodox in their own estimation, say the wicked shall be turned into hell; but they have made an agreement with hell. They call themselves deserving hell, for they are awfully wicked, but conclude they shall escape; for having promised to deliver to hell all but themselves—hell has agreed to be satisfied.

No people are more loud than this class, in their praises of piety, of justice, of love to God, and of love to the souls of men; and they threaten all, who are found wanting in any of these, with a doom awfully wretched. But notwithstanding they themselves come short in every thing, they conclude their pretences, and their menaces, and their mock humility, will satisfy death and hell, and consequently they will escape the doom prepared for others equally good with themselves. They contend we must worship God, and then act as if they believed the conditions of their covenant complied with, when they imagine certain feelings, when they repeat certain words, listen to certain sounds, and observe certain days. Hence we see these people very punctillious in small affairs. A certain day in a measured space must be spent in idleness, in the neglect of all business which would feed the hungry or clothe the naked, or in attending a certain house in which God is supposed to reside—to prostrate themselves, hear something said in the form of a petition, and something else which neither the speaker nor hearer is able to comprehend; or rather a part of which; for most sermons are made up of unintelligible propositions and denunciations of wrath. The denunciations are generally sufficiently plain to be understood.

Every man of common discernment ought to perceive that a man is not good because he

says he is—pious, because he professes to be, nor religious because he observes certain days or ceremonies. The kingdom of God does not consist in meats or drinks, nor does it come with observation or vain pomp and parade.—But it consists in an inward principle of virtue, and is exhibited by administering to the wants of the needy, giving bread to the hungry, clothing to the naked, houses to the shelterless, consolation to the mourner, and the oil of gladness to the sorrowful and broken hearted. But those of whom we speak seem contented to compromise the matter in such manner, that keeping the Sabbath, repeating prayers, and hearing sermons, will sufficiently establish their piety and preserve the terms of their covenant. If any thing more is wanting to conciliate the affections of death and to keep peace with hell, they are occasionally to assist death and hell in making those who are to be damned hereafter as miserable as possible while here. This may be called disciplining the multitude and making them so familiar with the despotism and suffering under which they are hereafter to groan, that hell will not become the scene of rebellion and death will not be troubled with the vexation and loss of a civil war. When our religious pretenders flatter themselves they have performed all these weighty conditions, they conclude their covenant stands strong; that their agreement is good, their refuge of lies a safe protection and heaven has become their birthright.

But it is unnecessary to pursue their character. The consequences of their practices claim our attention. There is a criterion, and it is the only one to which such short-sighted mortals as we are, can appeal with safety, or by which we can test the value of any sentiment or pursuit—there is a criterion, and this criterion is the *effect* which our practice has on the happiness of those with whom we are connected. It matters not how beneficial a man may *say* is the sentiment he defends or the course he pursues. It matters not how honourable or full of meaning may be the names he ascribes to his ceremonies and to his offerings. We must look farther. "By their fruits," says our Saviour, "shall ye know them. By this rule all must soon or late be tried, and it would be well if the consideration were allowed to sink deep into our minds, and cause us to enquire the quality of the fruit which ourselves bear.—These people of whom I speak, if one might believe what they say, are the salt of the earth; they are the Lots in the midst of Sodom without whom the world would soon be overwhelmed with vice. They may be right. We cannot tell what the world would have been without them, for they have always been in it. But I generally distrust the utility of a thing which is highly extolled. I conclude some one has an interest in praising it. When a man is loud in his own praise, pretends he is of mighty advantage to the world, we may conclude he is anxious to atone for the paucity of his benefits by the loudness with which he can extol himself. Hence the vain boasting and high encomiums upon themselves, common to this class of people, may lead one *a priori* to distrust their utility and the sincerity of their professions.

There is not a more lamentable consideration, than the one which often strikes us, that the foulest crimes and the blackest vices appear under the garb of religion. If we look impartially at the world as it now is, we shall see two classes—one professing to be very religious, the other saying little about religion, though practicing much. Meet a stranger—be told he belongs to a church—you may still enquire his morals, what is his conduct, whether he be charitable to his brethren, forbearing to his enemies, and merciful to the sufferers he meets. No one can deny the fact that the religious part of community, viewed as to their several relations in life, are no better, nay, they are not so good, as the part which say little about piety or systems of faith.

If we want a favour—if we wish assistance for a poor widow and her fatherless children, to whom do we go? Is there some publick enterprize, which requires a union of individual energy and publick spirit, liberality of thinking, integrity in trust and wisdom in execution—to whom do we go? To the church member? No, we have to look in the ranks of the world. The pious are so engrossed with heaven, they have no time, talents nor inclination to engage in that which might benefit the world, or impose a tax on their purse or on their humanity.

But there is a weighty evil in this. Men who obtain a salvo for their consciences from their professions—the conviction that they are holy from their attendance on formal duties, and an imagined passport to heaven from their declamations against the impiety of others, are not likely to encourage genuine virtue, or to be useful in disseminating good feeling among their brethren. Absolved by an idle ceremony from the crimes they have committed, they may continue to sin with impunity; for a prayer or a tear will exempt them from guilt and give them license to denounce without mercy, all who come not up to their standard of perfection. The habit of declamation and slander thus imbibed, sours the mind, sharpens the temper, and renders them detestable to all who come within their reach. Nor is this all. Such are the dispositions they encourage, they execrate each other, and their own ranks present a scene of bitterness, animosity and rage from which sickened humanity turns with bleeding heart.

Look on that village. As yet the priest has not made his appearance. See its inhabitants like a band of brothers, bound to each other by

the strong ties of fraternal affection. Each is ready to assist the other. They labour and partake almost in common. Their hours of relaxation or leisure are spent in each others society. Their evenings—they like one family collect around the cheerful fire and indulge their social feelings. The scene is a miniature picture of paradise. It is the garden of Eden. It is—the serpent winds his way into the midst—the professed man of God serpent-like winds among them, coils himself around the tree of knowledge, talks of his covenant with death, his agreement with hell, his refuge of lies in the day of judgement. Ah, whither has flown that bright vision? Look at the village again. What see you? Unanimity? No. There is a few become saints, and the rest are stigmatized as the *world*. Do you see mutual confidence? No. The demon distrust has soured their affections, and man can no longer put confidence in a brother. What do you hear? Heavenly musick? All voices raised in social and Divine worship? No. The discordant notes of a boasting Pharisee, crying, "ungodly sinner," "awfully wicked," "unbeliever," heretick," "repent, flee or you will go to hell," "God hates you, Jesus will spurn you, and the Holy Ghost will frown you into the bottomless pit."

It is a painful conclusion, but not more painful than true, that wherever the influence of these people is felt, the state of society is deplorable. That mutual confidence, necessary for mutual peace, is gone; and that disposition to be friendly to each other, or which binds the members together, and enables them to meet with pleasure, flies on the wings of the wind; continual defamation, complaining and anathematizing in the name of God and religion, follows as the legitimate fruit. Preachers tell us they are the ambassadors of God, commissioned to bear the best and most cheering intelligence to the suffering children of mortality. They speak—it is nothing but their covenant with death and their agreement with hell. They pray—it is only to induce us to comply with the conditions of the covenant and agreement; they go from house to house telling amid sighs and groans their message, but alas! when the solemn farce is over, we can count for gain little, except additional depravity and wretchedness.

But to be more particular: when it is imagined that the covenant is sure and the agreement will not be broken, the heart is puffed up with pride, the person casts a cold contemptuous look upon those he has not included in his stipulation with death and hell. He becomes full of self conceit, of imagined piety and pretended holiness; consequently in his own opinion obtaining a license to treat with contempt—with cruelty all who do not bow before the altar he has dedicated, or proclaim the absolute perfection of the God he worships. His behaviour becomes offensive, highly disgusting to every man of discernment, and his language, his reproofs, his exhorations, have the effect to harden the hearts and corrupt all the good feelings of those with whom he associates. Hence instead of reforming the world, regenerating the heart and making man beneficial or friendly to man, he exerts his power to destroy the natural beauty of their minds, and all that was good in their hearts or pleasing in their manners.

Yet it is fashionable to extol the religionist of the day, to speak of the importance of a regular ministry and to expend large sums of money to erect houses and to support persons for proclaiming that which a slight acquaintance with the history of the past, declares worse than useless. Millions are annually expended—for what? For what is the widow robbed of her mite and the poor kitchen maid of her scanty pittance? To make mankind better? What are all these mighty exertions about Home and Foreign Missions, Bible, Tract and Sabbath Societies, destined to effect? The good of mankind? No. They will do no more than strengthen the covenant with death or render firmer the agreement with hell. The whole concern is a refuge of lies and the actors are endeavouring to shelter themselves under falsehood from the overflowing scourge which shall pass through.

But will virtue, philanthropy and intelligence forever submit to these arts to procure the earnings of industry?—to these plans for monopolizing religion and degrading and demoralizing the great body of the community? Will the energies of the intellectual world never awake? Will oppressed humanity never learn to spurn the load it is compelled to bear? Will the few forever rule the many? And will the shepherds never learn to regard the welfare of the flock as the best means to secure their own? The decree has gone forth. "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I lay for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste. Judgement also will I lay to the line and righteousness to the plumet; and the hail shall sweep away your refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow your hiding place. And your covenant with death shall be disannulled and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, ye shall be trodden down by it." This is the decree.—Hear it ye who covenant with death—who say the sinner shall die, but we shall live—who say the wicked shall be turned into hell, but we shall escape—hear it and tremble. Your covenant shall be disannulled and your agreement shall not stand. Your system is too narrow, your charity too contracted; the bed you have prepared, "is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering nar-

rower than that he can wrap himself in it;" and you must flee to the rock of Truth, for your refuge of lies shall avail you nought and your hiding place of falsehood shall not protect you from the just indignation of that people whom you have insulted, robbed and enslaved.

The overflowing scourge—the acquisition of correct knowledge, the scourge of falsehood, the enemy of lies and the destruction of priestcraft, shall emancipate the human race; and the temple of universal liberty, of justice and equality, shall rise from the ruins of superstition, bigotry and intolerance; based upon the "corner stone," laid in Zion, it shall defy the attacks of time, and within its spacious enclosure the human race shall collect and pay their voluntary vows to the God of the Universe. The temple of Concord then shall rise, and the sun shall linger to catch the musick of her worshippers. But that time is distant. The supposed interest of a powerful body in the midst of us, bars the door to improvement and blocks the path to impede the march of truth. Interest—a mistaken view of interest—paralyzes the energies of intellect, palsies the arm of philanthropy and draws the chains of superstition still closer around its deluded victims. I look on my fellow men—slaves to the opinion of a being called a priest—I see them bow at his nod and burn with rage at his word, their lives devoted to his will, their property to feed him for debasing their minds and enveloping them in darkness that may be felt; I would let a ray of light beam upon their dark habitation; I would arouse the fire of intellect, wake every energy of the soul to break the mental bondage under which they lie. But the wish is vain, the day is distant when it can be done. But come it must. Priests and despots may as well attempt to

> "Lull the winged winds asleep,
> Arrest the rolling world or chain the deep,"

as to attempt to prevent its approach. A spirit of enquiry has already gone forth—investigation has commenced its mighty works, and the covenanters with death and hell may tremble for their craft.

> "Yet, yet, degraded men! the expected day
> That breaks your bitter cup, is far away;
> Trade, wealth and fashion, ask you still to bleed,
> And holy men give scripture for the deed."

But though the day be distant, let not our hearts be discouraged. The day will come. If we will discharge our duty to ourselves and to the world, we shall hasten its approach. I do not ask you to embrace a creed, to contend for my belief. We are all too much under the influence of the erroneous teachings of our ancestors to be able to judge correctly of truth or falsehood; but what I ask is, that you give the world an example of a people determined to think for themselves—to follow truth wherever her light shall direct, regardless of the name she may bear, or of the reproach you may receive from those who adhere to antiquated creeds and vain traditions of men.

We want a resting place—something on which we can repose with confidence. But our teachers have not given it. Their covenant with death gives no satisfaction, and their agreement with hell affords no peace to our minds long harrassed with care and anxiety. We have been led by a path which yields no pleasure, through a wilderness, a desert, where no bird is heard to sing—where no flower blossoms and no waters flow to quench our parching thirst. Let us leave this path—quit this barren waste—enquire if there be not a more pleasant road and a more fruitful country through which we can travel. We have long hung round the altar of superstition, or hugged the pillars of the temple of ignorance. Let us launch away—let the prosperous gale of enquiry waft us to the land of science and religion pure as it came from its Authour.

A reformation is needed. It must commence somewhere and it may as well commence with us as any where. If we have made a covenant with death, it shall be broken; if we have made lies our refuge the hail shall sweep it away, and the waters shall destroy our hiding place of falsehood. Nothing but truth will stand the ordeal which must soon be instituted. Let us, from the promises of God, from his protection of truth, take courage to examine what we have believed, to enquire what we have done, what we ought to believe and what we ought to do. We must survey the magnitude of the evil which exists; we must search for the remedy and watch our opportunity to apply it. The smallest pebble cast into the unruffled lake, sends the circles which succeed over the whole surface. No matter how few our number, we will press upon those who are next us; we will let our influence be felt by those with whom we are associated. These may press upon others, and thus on, till the world be agitated by the exertions we make. The stone that was cut from the mountains was small, but it grew, became a mountain that filled the whole earth. The slightest spark may kindle a conflagration, and we, by letting our light shine, by being determined to maintain our own mental independence, may encourage others until a force of character, a weight of influence be accumulated, sufficient to shake the empire of darkness and make the tyrants of conscience resign their pretentions, and be glad to break the chains with which they have bound the human race.

Inspiration has promised, experience warrants the expectation, philanthropy prays for its approach, and suffering humanity calls aloud that it speed its progress, and the day shall come, when the priests' lips shall keep KNOWLEDGE—when the people shall not be spoiled by those who call themselves instruc-

tors—when we need not every one tell his brother and his neighbour, know the Lord, for all shall know him from the least to the greatest. However distant the day may seem, the march of intellect shall hasten its approach; and the happiness it promises shall as certainly be enjoyed as the laws of nature remain unaltered. We may look forward with the most pleasing anticipations—forward to the time when the equality of the human race, whether viewed in the eye of government or of religion, will be universally felt and acknowledged—when the priest shall not fatten on our credulity—when the religionist will obtain his passport to heaven only from his virtue or the utility of his conduct—when the grand enquiry will be not what is orthodox, or what is the opinion of the church; but what are just feelings—what is just knowledge, and what conduct will be conducive to the maintenance of good order and universal felicity. I look forward to that time with the deepest feelings of philanthropy, with the holiest emotions, and would that I could infuse what I feel into the bosom of each that hear me, and excite the same ardent desire to bring near that blessed day.

"Come, bright Improvement! on the car of Time,
And rule the world from clime to clime.
Thy handmaid arts shall every wild explore—
Tracé every wave and culture every shore.
Where barbarous hordes on Scythian mountains roam,
Truth, Mercy, Freedom, yet shall find a home.
Where e'er degraded nature weeps and pines,
From Guinea's coast to Sibir's dreary mines—
Truth shall pervade the unfathomed darkness there
And light the dreadful features of despair."

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

NO. VII.

ON MIRACLES.

Time has been, when to reason was crime and to speak the truth was deemed treason against the Sovereign of Nature. Much of the spirit, which then prevailed, may yet remain, but the march of improvement has so far softened the rigours of our institutions, that one may now venture to state his honest convictions without endangering his head, how much soever he may expose himself to starvation or to the loss of all means of support.

The church has in all ages manifested an exceeding fondness for the marvellous, and indeed has rested the most important parts of her creed on the supposition that its first defenders performed certain wonderful feats or miracles. A miracle, according to the definition usually given, is something which takes place contrary to the laws of nature, or something which is done in opposition to them. It is certain no being less wise than Omniscience can determine whether a thing, according to this definition, be a miracle or not. Nature is a broad term. It comprehends whatever is. It would not perhaps be difficult to demonstrate the absolute impossibility of miracles in this sense of the term, but it is unnecessary. But we ought to clearly perceive all the laws of nature and to know all the possible operations of which these laws are susceptible, before we pronounce any thing to take place contrary to the laws of nature.

All we know of nature, is that little part which has come under our own observation, and all we can affirm of the laws of nature, is what our experience has determined to have been its order or mode of opperation since our observations commenced. Should I be told a clergyman raised, by a word, a man from the dead; all I could say, is, that such things are contrary to *my* experience. Should my informant insist upon its being a fact, should he alledge he saw it, and should he adduce sufficient evidence to convince me it is a fact, I should not say it was contrary to nature. I should pronounce it *natural*, because it had been *seen* and experience attested its truth. But this act could not be called a miracle. The most that could be said of it, would be that it was an extraordinary or an uncommon occurrence.

To pronounce such an event contrary to the laws of nature, would require us to know positively there is no law by which it could be done, therefore must have been done in opposition to them all. Our knowledge is too limited for this. And, as all that we have, by which to determine what is the law of nature, is our experience, the same rule which leads us to attribute the growth of a tree, or the revolution of a world, to the laws of nature, or which would call them natural occurrences, would require us to affirm the same of raising a man from the dead, if we had even seen such an event. Raising a man from the dead, by a mere word, would be no miracle.

But admitting it would be a miracle, what would it prove? Supposing one should assert two and two are four and should raise a man from the dead, would that make his assertion more true? Certainly not. If one should assert two and two make five and should, to prove this assertion true, raise a man from the dead—should arrest the sun and chain the world in the midst of its course, would that prove that two and two are five? I think every school-boy would, notwithstanding such tremendous display, still continue to say, two and two are four. What then can a miracle prove?

There are various extraordinary occurrences related in the Bible; such as the sun's standing still, the dead's being raised by touching the bones of a prophet, the whale's swallowing Jonah, the devil's carrying Jesus Christ around, setting him upon a high mountain and upon the battlements of the temple, a talking

serpent, a warning ass, transformations, bursting of tombs, rising from the graves, ascending to heaven in a chariot of fire, &c. Now, these things are said to have taken place. Doctors have written to prove the verity of the history recording them, and it would be impious for us to withhold our assent; but what do they prove? Supposing I should assert that there is a God, and should raise a man from the dead, what would I prove? Simply that I had raised a man from the dead; nothing more. My act, or this exertion of my power, could have, in the nature of things, no more connection with the moral truth or with my assertion that there is a God, than my being able to whip my boy proves that I should be justified in so doing. An ignorant, gaping multitude might admire the feats of a jugglar, and conclude he had made a league with the devil, because he could do that which they were unable to perform, but that is no certain evidence their conclusion would be true.

Should I assert that mankind will rise from the dead, or that myself were the Son of God, and to substantiate my assertions, should perform signs and wonders, cast out demons, heal the sick and do that which no body else could do, I should not prove my assertions. I should only prove myself an extraordinary person, capable of doing what the spectators of my strange acts would be incapable of performing. This would be all. There being no perceivable connection between the doctrines I assert and the work I perform, I could only prove, by my acts, that I had performed them. This reasoning is so plain and so conclusive, that I am surprized that any should rely on the miracles which Christ performed as evidences of the doctrines he taught.

It will be admitted as nothing singular, that persons beholding the wonderful works of the saints of old, should be impressed with the conviction they were from God. Should I see one raise to life another who I knew was actually dead, doubtless I should be so lost in wonder that I should believe almost any thing the person should assert. It is not then denied but in the age in which they were performed, these extraordinary performances were calculated to make the people believe on the persons who made them. There is nothing strange in this. In that age, these things, or this supposed evidence, addressed to the outward senses, might have been useful, perhaps the best kind of evidence the people then were capable of appreciating. They doubtless had their use. It is remarkable that miracles, or what are so called, are most abundant among ignorant people. The reason is probably because, incapable of investigation, they must have something to astonish.

To rely on miracles or extraordinary occurrences as conclusive evidence of moral or religious truth, is by no means the mark of a philosophick mind, how much soever it may characterize the ignorant. They are only particular events and cannot prove general truths. They no more prove any thing but themselves, that they have occurred, than I should prove myself a god, by cutting off one of my hands. We are unable to draw any inferences from such things. Were they regular and of frequent occurrence, we might perhaps have some rational opinions respecting the cause or power by which they are produced. To us they appear strange anomalies in the operations of nature and as such we must leave them.

One thing it may be well to notice, that the credit or importance attached to miracles, is proportioned to their antiquity or distance. In reading the history of the Jews, one meets with signs and wonders on every page, particularly at the period the House of Israel departed from Egypt. But is it not a little singular, that this people who was loaded with so many prodigies from heaven, who were led by a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night—who saw the sea open to give them a passage and the water gush from the rock to quench their thirst, should have disregarded all and remained a stiff-necked and rebellious people? The only solution worthy to be given, is, these remarkable occurrences, which to us are rare as angels' visits, were then so common they passed as the ordinary events of the day.

The miracles recorded in the bible were doubtless performed. I admit these acts were done. I do not dispute the bible. I only alledge that these miracles are no evidence to us of the truth of the doctrines taught in the bible. This distinction is of importance, as it preserves the truth of the bible and obviates the objections which Infidels have urged against it. The events were performed. They were isolated facts. They do not, they cannot prove the truth of any abstract doctrine, whether moral or religious. These miracles then stand as they were recorded, but we should seek elsewhere for the evidence of the truth of Christianity. Christianity must be supported by facts of a different character, or it will fall before the attacks of its sharp-sighted opposers.

THE TIMES.

NO. I.

Under this head I propose making such remarks upon the present state of things, of the institutions which are, or which ought to be adopted, as my observations and reflections have suggested. I shall pursue a rambling strain; and I advertise my readers that if they will profit by what I have to present them, they must note my remarks rather as individual sayings than as parts of a regular discussion.

I dislike that sickly disposition which takes affright at every incident or shrieks alarm at

merely the rustling of a leaf. But a just apprehension founded on a full view of the dangerous movements of an ambitious faction, whether of a religious or political character, is salutary to the preservation of liberty, or of the rights of every member of society.

The basis of virtue is intelligence; and the welfare of every state, of every body, civil or ecclesiastical, requires the active industry of all its members. Each member should also clearly perceive his importance to the whole, and fully understand the part which in the general distribution is allotted him to perform. It therefore becomes important that the elementary principles, on which the permanence and utility of society are based, should be frequently exhibited, that the old may refresh their memories, and the young learn by what rules their conduct should be governed.

Liberty, equality and justice, are three terms frequently used in civil and moral institutions, though they are unknown in most religious theories. These terms are the synonymes of each other. Liberty is equality, and equality is justice. Neither can subsist in any state, where there is not an equilibrium preserved between all the members of which that state is composed. The lenity of a sovereign, or the indifference of a predominant party, may leave the great body of the people in the exercise of their inherent rights; but whenever an individual, or a party, gain an artificial superiority over their brethren, liberty, equality or justice, rests upon no solid or permanent foundation, and is every moment in danger of being annihilated.

It is the boast of our government that the people are their own rulers. All men, by our constitution, are declared equal. All have the same rights and immunities, and are entitled to the same voice in deciding by what laws they will be governed. Our constitution supposes there is an equilibrium between all who adopt it, and that in administering the affairs of government, one man is of equal right with another. Whenever then, one man acquires some additional weight in the eyes of government, so that he overbalances another, the fundamental maxim of our constitution is violated, and liberty is endangered.

This equality is, however only nominal. Probably it can never be reduced to practice: for while there exists as we know there does, a physical inequality, it will be hard to preserve a moral or political equality. Should we examine our government in detail, pursue it through all its ramifications, we might be forcibly impressed with the difference between the equality which it preserves, and the one it declares every one's birth right. Setting aside the great difference it makes between the two sexes, a difference that probably can plead nothing better than caprice, we may observe several classes of citizens which do in effect rule the others with as much absolute authority as ever was possessed by a despot.

An absolutely free government can exist only in theory. It never has been, and I know not as it ever can be reduced to practice. Indeed all government is a usurpation of right, justified only by the necessity of imposing some restraint upon the passions of all, for the benefit of each. The true art of all governments, is doutless to govern as little as possible, and it seems to have been the mistake of all—attempting to govern too much. All that government should aim at, is to preserve as much equality among its subjects, as possible. It deviates from its legitimate object whenever it gives to an individual, to a party, or to any body, larger or smaller, any additional weight or importance, in the affairs of state.

All government receives its authority from opinion. Hence, nearly all which has existed, has endeavored to mould the opinions of the people in favour of itself. It has therefore, often imposed restrictions upon speech, upon the press, prohibiting the teaching or the circulating of opinions, which would tend to undermine its authority or to weaken the support it requires for its subsistence. It has laboured to fortify itself by imparting power to individuals or to parties, who are the most influential in the state; associating with itself the bigoted attachments, or superstitious fears of its members; giving to a part the power to maintain the obedience of the rest.

All states in their first organization, are more or less free—liberty generally predominates. The government is weak, but the people are powerful. A struggle commences—a grasping for power. The government extends its prerogative, joins with those whose interest it is to enlarge its power, addresses itself to the love of power which is common to its citizens, forms a party in its favour, enlists the most influential to support its claims, by giving them leave to rule; and then after a struggle separates its interests from the people, and ends perhaps in tyranny or despotism. Every man loves power, every party whether religious or civil, is fond of dominion. With parties as with individuals this becomes the ruling passion. Hence under a free government, this is the most dangerous enemy to be encountered, and to resist its encroachment, is nearly all government can or ought to do. But to do this, requires the utmost vigilence and caution, as it respects its own measures, or the measures of any class of its citizens.

There are numerous methods of acquiring power, or for one to exercise more than his portion of authority. These methods are such as are afforded by superiour wealth, abilities, education, and artful management of prevailing opinions &c. Against the acquisition of wealth, of individual wealth, government cannot, ought not to interfere; but against the acquisition of

wealth, to be held by particular bodies or corporations, especially against such bodies, or corporations, as do not submit to the authority of the magistrate, in disposing of the wealth they acquire; government can, and ought to be on its guard, and to raise its authority. Religious bodies, and sectarian corporations in particular, come under this class. But as I shall treat these more largely hereafter, I let them pass for the present.

Of superiour abilities I say nothing. They are beyond the reach of government, and would prove its destruction, were it able to reduce them. The good which flows from them, overbalances the evil they sometimes occasion. Of education much may be said, and much may be done.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

TO THE LEADING ORTHODOX CLERGY.

NO. I.

GENTLEMEN:—The imposing dignity of your office and the piety of your pretentions, entitle you to the regard of mankind; and require the respectful attention of all who feel interested in the cause of virtue, or in the establishment and perpetuity of civil liberty. I have examined the justness of your claims and duly considered the benevolence of your exertions. I make no apology for expressing to you the high sense I have of your importance to our happiness, as individuals, and to our existence as a nation.

To follow you in your etherial rambles—to understand your conversation with angels, or to judge correctly of your premises and conclusions respecting the land of spirits, demands powers which only you have a right to claim, and to which I have no ambition to pretend. Your title to the region of shadows will not be contested—your familiar acquaintance with worlds and beings beyond the boundaries of sense will be cheerfully conceded, and none but an ignorant or a conceited rebel will dispute your superiority in all matters exclusively spiritual. But finding myself bound to this little globe, which, though nothing to your comprehensive minds, is all to me, destitute of the extraordinary discernment of a priest, I must confess I am peculiarly attracted by your unwearied exertions to reduce the stubbornness of our wills and the native independence of our minds, to an implicit obedience to your dictation and undeviating adherence to your pious instructions.

In this country we make little of ancestry. But when a man or a class of men, adheres, without the least deviation, to the spirit and conduct of a long line of illustrious ancestors, who plead the appointment of the Almighty, as the patent of their nobility, it must be admitted the descendant is entitled to all the honours of the father; and when one adopts from choice and obeys with the most unshaken resolution the lessons of paternal instruction, it is certain he has a right to the glory of his ancestors and to be considered as inheriting all their virtues. You can boast an ancestry that might make the proudest pretenders to antiquity blush for the recentness of their origin, and the dilapidated noble, who can trace his family back to the resting of the Ark upon Ararat, seem an upstart of the last generation!

Your reverences will recollect the first of your race, recorded in history, was coeval with the first of the human family; that he was justly renowned as being more subtle than any other beast the Lord God had created; and, what must exalt you in the estimation of the discerning, your claim to the same character, has been maintained with the utmost scrupulosity and success from that time to this. The father of the priesthood commenced his labours, when coiled around the tree of knowledge, by a sermon upon good and evil, upon knowledge and death; and true to his example, the burden of the discourses pronounced, by your line ever since, has been the same, and with this singular good fortune, that the people have never been able to discern good from evil, nor to acquire knowledge sufficient to preserve them from the premature death your extraordinary care has procured for many.

This renowned ancestor, whose spirit, like the mantle of Elijah, with a double portion, has fallen upon his descendants, enforced his lessons with the promise that his auditors should become gods; and, though in more modern times the promise is varied in words, the spirit remains entire. Your reverences promise your disciples that they shall become sons of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ whom you teach us to call the eternal Jehovah.

Your ancestors were highly esteemed. They had the credit of being counsellors to kings and emperours. They were the directors of all important affairs. Their hate could create a war and involve nations in ruin. Their fear, or malice, or treachery, could stay the arm of battle and leave one army to be consigned to the feebleness of death by the other.

They examined private life. The most secret of the domestick apartments were open to their inspection. The most sacred and the most endearing engagements and connections could not be observed until they had said their prayer or pronounced their benediction.

Their care commenced ere the child was born and ceased not till after its death. All in publick and private life was subject to their direction; and they received a tenth of the products of the earth, the firstlings of the flocks and the most choice part of every offering, besides donations, charitable contributions, and numerous exactions, as their portion secured to them by the will of their Lawgiver. You need not blush to hear me enumerate the splendour, the wealth and the power of your ancestors; for, as you inherit their virtues, you are entitled to their honours.

The cry of degeneracy, which is often raised against a once eminent family, cannot be raised against the Priesthood. With a zeal that baffles credulity and a steadiness of purpose that almost argues the intervention of a miracle, the whole family have adhered to the principles of their founder and even improved up-

on his cunning, and far surpassed him in the art of deception, and in making mankind miserable.

To your race, gentlemen, it is, that we can attribute most of the wars which have depopulated the world. Your lessons have overwhelmed empires and your pious instructions have had the facility to reduce mighty nations to a single page of the historian or to a stanza in the song of the bard. We give you credit for the intestine divisions with which the people are often torn, and to your salutary preaching may be ascribed most of those secret vices which are fostered in our bosoms; that hatred, malice, and love of revenge, which have made the earth a miniature picture of that place, where your God, in the plenitude of his mercy it is said, will burn the majority of his own offspring forever. The earth has been well fattened with the blood of your victims and watered with the tears you have caused.

Your reverences may think I give you credit for more than your modesty would claim, or even more than you are deserving. But I do not. I am unlearned to flatter, and the language of praise would ill become me if destitute of truth. The estate of the father may descend to the children; and when the children obey the parental instructions, it would be injustice to deprive them of the inheritance. You are entitled to all this and more. The dark ages reflect a flood of glory upon the utility of your office. Then your sun of darkness reached his zenith, and the meridian splendour of his rays gathered around the priesthood and spread over the people. Then were the golden days of the church. Then the clergy sported in all the wild luxuriance of ignorance and cruelty, rejoiced in the devastations they made, and laughed at the crimes which, by their license or their example, were encouraged to overwhelm the land.

But I would not surfeit you with praise of your ancestors, nor depress your spirits by feebly exhibiting their glory. When you have reconciled yourselves to this account of others, I shall point out some of your personal achievements, and publish to the world a more enlarged account of the honesty, usefulness and benevolence of a priest. Yours, respectfully,

PHILO CLERICUS.

REV. ABNER KNEELAND.

It is with shame and bitter regret we have witnessed the cruel and unfeeling persecutions of this aged, and faithful and talented defender of liberal sentiments. We have been silent, for we waited for older men to speak. They have spoken, but with one* solitary exception, it has been to show how well they can persevere in ingratitude. It has then come to this, that we boys, mere striplings in Israel, must show our manhood by insulting grey hairs and build up the cause of the Redeemer, by hurling our anathemas at one who has nearly worn out his life in defending our common cause?

Three associations have withdrawn fellowship from Br. Kneeland, and several editors from whom we had hoped different things have approved of their conduct. What was the charge? None, or none that Universalists should not blush to own. Did they prefer any charge? None, or if they did, Br. Kneeland was tried and condemned unheard. This done too by persons who profess to be Universalists! It must have been an inconsiderate act, and we should hope that its authours will see its impropriety. We think publickly to withdraw fellowship from a preacher, without even notifying him that he is accused of the accusation, or giving him a chance to defend himself, is as antichristian as it must be painful to the feelings of the one thus treated.

But why was this done? Because *somebody* thought that if Br. Kneeland was not publickly disowned, the orthodox would say—what? why that Universalists fellowship a man whose faith is incorrect. The amount of it seems to be this: Br. Kneeland either preached or published something which was not generally understood and our timorous friends were afraid the orthodox would call it Atheism, and that would prove ruinous to our cause. So it is, men start at a shadow, and shriek at the rustling of a leaf.

We have no personal acquaintance with Br. Kneeland. We have read his writings, or some of them. From these we have received a favourable idea of his talents. And though we may not be as quick as some to detect heresy, we are free to confess, we have seen nothing in his publications offensive to our orthodoxy. For ourself we are well aware how this controversy originated. In our opinion it was at first purely *personal*. But let that pass.

Many Universalists have, no doubt, entertained the idea that Br. Kneeland is sceptical. Let it be so; though we have no evidence to satisfy *us* that such is the fact—let it be that he is sceptical—that he does not believe as much as some of the rest of us, what shall we do? Excommunicate? Where is the blush to crimson our countenances when we speak of excluding one on the account of his faith? Let us go and ask pardon of the orthodox for what we have written and published against them, for excommunicating believers in Universalism from their church, before we adopt their practice.

"But," says one, "would you fellowship an Atheist?" Yes, as a man, and would protect his reputation from unjust reproach. "But would you fellowship him as a preacher?" If I believed with him I would say so—if I did not, I could let my own opinion be known, and should not fear what I believed to be false would gain the victory over what I deemed truth, if both were told. We are at a loss to understand excommunication among Universalists. We have no *hell* in which we can burn anathematized members; but we believe all are brethren; and we, for ourself, know no better way to do with delinquent members than to treat them kindly, and endeavour to heal their backslidings.

"But we shall suffer reproach from unworthy members." *Who* will suffer reproach? We are sick of this squeamishness. We want more independence of mind. If a man preaches Atheism, any fool may

*One other editor has indeed not joined in the proscription.

know he does not preach Universalism. As for reproach from the orthodox, we expect, and we scorn it. Let us be careful and not fall into their errours. Let us not reproach every one who may not believe quite as much as we, to make ourselves popular among the orthodox. We have spoken plainly. It is our custom. We mean no offence to any one. Our object is to do justice to one whom we think to have been injured in the house of his friends.

The editor of the "Albany Christian Register," is not yet satisfied. Despairing of renown by publishing accidents and baby-conversions, notices of tracts, drunkards and missionaries, he appears ambitious to borrow, by holding a controversy with the editor of the Gospel Advocate, a popularity to which he can never reach. We shall however spare him the mortification of publishing his article entire and do what we can to save his character, by concealing his productions.

He has accused us of a charge grievous to mention and threatens to book us "to the falsehood side of the ledger," if we do not explain. Our name has been accustomed to keep good company; and it would be painful to our feelings to see it set down on the side occupied by that of the editor of the Albany Christian Register. A charge of falsehood from him however, would be deemed by all who are acquainted with his paper, the best compliment he could pay.

We have said, "Orthodoxy says the soul that sinneth *ought* to die; but if one will only say he is sorry and think a good deal of the priest, he may go to heaven, the justice of God to the contrary notwithstanding." Mr. Hoffman has not denied the charge, but accuses us of lying because we have refused to tell him what particular class of the orthodox we meant. Admirable logick! Its authour may hope to be soon transferred from the editorial to the professor's chair.

Yet he acknowledges it true of a certain class else why does he require us to point out the class we had in our mind? We know not how many classes there may be of the orthodox. We have been otherwise employed than in learning the classification of those whom ignorance or intolerance might allow to be orthodox. We meant, in our charge, the Presbyterians and all who contend one can go to heaven, when he deserves to go to hell. We gave not the letter of their doctrine, but the spirit of their preaching.

These people condemn good works—cry out against morality, and tell us the murderer may go to heaven, if, five minutes before his death, he will call to his side the priest, and say he is sorry for what he has done. Look at Van Patten, the murderer of Mrs. Schemmerhorn—at How, the murderer of Othello Church. These men called the priests, were very confiding, said they were very sorry, and the pious, after their execution, said they had no doubts of their final acceptance with God. These men never reformed, at least, to our knowledge. Had they gone forth into the world they might have been as bad as ever.—If it was certain they had reformed, why were they executed? And what had the orthodox to build their hopes of their salvation upon, but their attention to the priests, and their saying they were sorry?

Mr. Hoffman has denied his nature, to manifest so much feeling on this subject—has forgotten his native insensibility; but we will assure him, he may be calm; for we have given him a true picture of his own doctrine—a doctrine which originated in ignorance, and has been believed mostly by persons of his stamp, though others from a love of gain have taught it. We reiterate our charge, and if Mr. Hoffman calls it false, we shall either answer him, he is ignorant of the people he defends, or that falsehood, in his vocabulary means truth.

We have said enough. We take our leave of this editor. We have more important concerns which demand our attention. The absence of all literary, moral and scientifical knowledge in his paper, the extreme paucity of intellect and manhood in its editorial department, has rescued his paper from our contempt; and will forever, we trust, secure to the editor the mercy of our silence. Adieu. EDITOR.

The following painful intelligence will be read by all our friends with sorrow, though we hope with resignation. Mr. Bisbe was one of our most able, learned and active preachers. He is gone, and we deplore his loss. May the kindness of our God be with his bereaved family, and give comfort to all his weeping friends.—EDITOR GOS. ADV.

DEATH OF REV. JOHN BISBE.

It becomes our painful duty to announce to our readers the death of our worthy brother, Reverend JOHN BISBE, Jr., Pastor of the Universalist Church and Society in Portland, aged 36, who departed this life on Sabbath morning March 8th, after a short sickness of eight days only. This sudden—this mysterious dispensation of Providence must cast an unusual gloom on all our sister churches and societies. In the prime of life, in the midst of great usefulness, our much beloved brother BISBE is suddenly cut off. In his death, the Church and Society in Portland have sustained a loss—a loss of one of the most talented, eloquent and faithful of Pastors; and a bereaved wife and children mourn the sudden exit of a kind husband and an indulgent father. We have not the means now of giving a particular account of Br. B.'s useful life. Suffice it to say he was born in the town of Plympton, Mass., of respectable parentage. Manifesting an early love of science, he was put to study under circumstances favourable to his progress in literature. He was prepared for college under the instruction of the Rev. Z. Willis, of Kingston. In that venerable and learned divine's private study, Br. BISBE and the present editor of this paper passed a considerable time together prosecuting their studies—in which they mutually assisted each other in the Latin and Greek languages, and in Mathematicks. It is but common justice to Br. B. to say, he

discovered an extraordinary aptness in learning. What to some is a task, was to him a pleasure, and without much seeming effort, attained. His progress was rapid almost beyond example. Having fitted for college, he entered Brown University, we believe one or two years in advance, where he was distinguished through his course of studies as the ripest scholar in his class. On retiring from college, after obtaining the usual degrees, he commenced the study of the Law in Taunton, in the office of a distinguished Counsellor in that town; but his mind inclining to religion, and being about that time enlightened by the truth of God's universal goodness, he felt it his solemn duty to devote his life and talents to the defence of the benevolent religion of Jesus. Accordingly, abandoning his legal studies, he entered the ministry, and commenced preaching in Brookfield. Subsequently he received an invitation to settle in Hartford, where he laboured in word and doctrine for three or four years. The state of things there not being altogether acceptable to him, nearly two years ago he accepted the invitation of the Universalist Society in Portland, to become its Pastor, where he preached to great acceptance and with much usefulness till a few days before his death. His circumspection was such, that even his enemies did him reverence. As a preacher, Mr. B. was plain and decided; as an orator, few divines were before him; as a pastor, he was always attentive to the duties of his office, seeking out the lambs of Christ and leading them to drink of the still waters of divine goodness, and to recline on the green pastures of everlasting love; binding up the broken hearted, comforting those that mourn; encouraging the virtuous and admonishing the erring. Alas! a bright star has retired to be seen no more! But we mourn not as those who have no hope. Exulting in the prospect of death, and remaining firm in the doctrine he preached, he has fallen asleep to awake in celestial realms of everlasting light and love. We bow with submission; praying that this dispensation of Providence may be sanctified to the spiritual good of us all.—*Christian Int.*

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. BADGER AND MR. STOW'S LETTERS.

(*Concluded from page 95.*)

MR. BADGER TO MR. STOW.—No. 3.

"*If any man suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed.*"—PETER.

SENNETT, FEBRUARY 13, 1829.

Rev. Mr. Stow—Sir:

Having become satisfied that you do not intend to answer my last letter, it becomes my duty to address you again. And indeed sir, you must allow me under present circumstances, to take great liberty; and if this correspondence is a burthen to you, you can console yourself as well as possible under the pleasing reflection that "God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass," and that your acquaintance with me, is a job of your own seeking.

There is one thing which I have not named: When you gave my appointment, I am informed that you said, Mr. B. is a "*Christ-yan.*" Would you not reprove the wicked children of your streets, if you should hear them giving false names to each other? Yet you can stand in the sacred desk, and nickname your liberal neighbours without remorse. Now common sense must have taught you that there is not a person in the world who takes the above party name. Next time please to say, "Brethren, we profess to be *Christians*, but we are *Calvinistick*, *Trinitarian Presbyterians;* but Mr. B. is just what we profess to be—a 'CHRISTIAN.' He is not what we are, but what we profess to be; he has no *creed* but his *bible*, and is a bold supporter of Christian liberty.

The doctrine of the Trinity is not yet fairly introduced as a matter of discussion between us, though I am very willing it should be in any method you please. But our labours have been upon the justice or injustice, propriety or impropriety of your corrosive attack on me from your pulpit. Was it the purpose for which the people at Elbridge built that pulpit? that from that *sanctum sanctorum* they might hear other ministers slandered and anathametized as hereticks? Is this the purpose for which your people meet on the first day of the week? Is this the purpose for which your respectable congregation have employed you? Think of these things with solemnity, while you retire from the field, and shrink from a contest which you have commenced in a most *arrogant, arbitrary* and *insulting manner*. But though you refuse all honourable measures ot give satisfaction to men, let me entreat you to humble yourself before the searcher of hearts, and seek the pardon of a merciful God, lest thy persecuting conduct towards the disciples of Jesus, should stare thee in the face on the *bed of death*, or *arise* in *judgement* to thy shame and confusion.

Now sir, you refuse to confess your fault upon the authority of my *note*. In my next I propose to submit the affair to three disinterested men of your own choice, or to the male members of your congregation; to which you make no reply. The messenger who carried my letter, after waiting two days and two nights, calls, agreeable to his instruction, for the answer, as he told you he should when he gave you my letter, but no answer is returned. In publick you have commenced with me; before that publick you must *confess your fault* or *defend yourself*. I have no more proposals to make to you, but to an insulted publick alone I shall now appeal.

You should have known that instead of call-

ing on me as you have done, with your five questions for me to prove a *negative*, it was your duty to prove the affirmative. You have made a declaration to the publick in character of fact; now support that fact like a man of honour.

In my next I shall take as much liberty to ask questions as you have done, yet I hope out of better motive, and I shall not pretend to dictate to you the form and words of your answer, nor shall I *command* you to say, "*yes or no and nothing more*," but should be pleased with a friendly and liberal discussion.

With all due respect and friendship,

I am, sir, yours,

J. BADGER.

REV. MR. STOW, *Elbridge.*

MR. BADGER TO MR. STOW, No. 4.

"*But unto us there is but one God,—and one Lord Jesus Christ.*" 1 Cor. viii. 6.—PAUL.

SENNETT, Feb. 28, 1829.

Rev. Mr. Stow—Sir:

Since my last I have been informed by some of your neighbors, that in case I would write my sentiments on the character of Christ, you would read my communication to your congregation. This being your declaration, to satisfy your friends, I am willing to condescend to their wishes and once more bring you to the test, though I have little reason to think you will fulfil your engagement in this respect, since you have refused to read my note in public, or submit this affair to three disinterested men of your own choice, or to the male members of your congregation, as I have proposed. But still it is my duty to be accommodating, and act the Christian part, for I have never calculated to ask any thing unreasonable of you in this case.

The task, sir, to write my views upon the doctrine of the *Trinity in full*, would be considerable under my present circumstances. For three months past I have attended as many meetings as there has been days, and you must know that I have very little leisure, and write under unfavourable circumstances being from home, and upon the arduous labours of a Missionary. I trust, therefore, you will be satisfied with a very brief view of my opinion of GOD, CHRIST, the HOLY GHOST, and some of the reasons why I dissent from the doctrine of the TRINITY; and I hope to be so plain as to leave no room for mistake on the subject. Should you wish for a more full explanation, as soon as I have leisure I will write again or will with pleasure preach at your village on the subject, if you will attend. I should be as happy to speak on the character of Christ before my accusers, as Paul was to speak before AGRIPPA.

1st. GOD IS ONE PERSON—is the creator of all things—is *omnipotent*, *omniscient*, *omnipresent*—the God of the Jews and FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. And is to be reverenced by all in Heaven and Earth, as the Father of Mercies and the giver of every blessing.

2d. JESUS CHRIST is the "SON OF GOD." As "THE SON" the Father hath proclaimed him. Mat. iii. 17, xvii. 5. As "THE SON" he hath acknowledged himself. Mat. xxvi. 64; John x. 36. As "THE SON" the Apostles preached him. Rom. i. 4: 1 John iv. 9, 14, 15. As "THE SON" primitive Christians believed in him. Acts viii. 37; 1 John v. 5. As "THE SON" the Angels worship him. Luke ii. 13, 14; Heb. i. 6.; Rev. v. 11, 12.

The "SON OF GOD" is that *divine word* which was in the beginning with the Father, who in due time descended from Heaven, and became poor that we thro' his poverty might be made rich—and when he had lived our example, and proclaimed his Father's willingness to pardon and save a lost world—He tasted death for *every man*—arose from the grave—brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel—ascended on high and sat down on "the right hand of God," and ever lives to make intercession for us. And is to be honoured and worshiped as the "LAMB SLAIN" by all the host of Heaven, Earth and Sea. Rev. v. 12, 13.

The "SON OF GOD" I consider a divine person because his ORIGIN (John viii. 42, xvi. 27, 28.; Heb. i. 5.) NATURE (John i. 14; 2 Pet. i. 4.) WORKS (Mat. xi. 5.; Acts x. 42; Heb. vii. 25.) TITLES (Isa. ix. 6.; Mat. i. 23.) and WORSHIP are divine. This holy character being begotten by the *Holy Ghost* (Luke i. 35.) made of the word of God, John i. 14, required no change before his assention, only to have that fluid which he had received from under the law, or from the mother to be drained off, which was effectually done on the cross. (Heb. ii. 10.) His flesh could then appear to his disciples, though the doors were shut (John xx. 26) and his body was prepared to ascend to Heaven, and *that which died on the cross is an object of worship in glory.* Rev. v. 12, 13. I believe the flesh of Christ to be far superiour to ours, and dignified and exalted beyond expression. With this view of the subject we see the exalted nature of his atonement.

3d. THE HOLY GHOST, is that divine and holy spirit, by which the world is reproved, enlightened, and believers are sanctified—which is sent from the father in the name of the son, (John xiv. 26,) and is that agent by which saints are assisted in the discharge of all their duties, and by which God will eventually quicken and raise their mortal bodies from the grave.

The above being the plain and simple doctrine of the bible, as taught by Christ and his Apostles, I shall now present a few reasons why I reject the doctrine of the *Trinity.*

1st. The doctrine of the Trinity is contrary to all rational principles of reason. Man is constituted a rational being;—Revelation is an

appeal to the understanding of man, on which his reason and judgement are required to act. And we are not required by the gospel to believe any thing which is not tangible to our senses.

2d. It is contrary to plain testimony of scripture. The bible declares, that "God is one." (Deut. vi. 4.) Trinity says "God is three." The bible says "Christ is the Son of God." Trinity says "Christ is that very Eternal God which he is the son of."

3d. It involves the idea that the Eternal God was born of a woman. If this is the case all trinitarians ought to join with the Catholics and worship MARY as the *Mother of God.*

4th. It involves the idea that the Eternal God died on the cross or that nothing but human nature died. If the Eternal God died, who upheld the Heavens and Earth, while God lay three days in the tomb? Oh! shocking inconsistency, the best feelings of man revolt at the thought. If Christ's flesh was no more than ours and nothing but the flesh died, what have we but a *human atonement*? Oh!! degrading thought. Every trinitarian ought to blush while he reflects upon the contradictions found in his doctrine; and should abandon it as a production of the wilderness, which has been forced upon the world by the Roman sword, and is now propagated by superstition and a zeal for God which is not according to knowledge.

5th. The doctrine of the trinity, makes its subjects uncharitable and self-righteous: And is the first objection which the Infidel, Jew, Mahometan and Pagan present against the Christian Religion. And is one of the greatest hindrances to its progress in the world, and will always make a contention in the church, until the simple and blessed doctrine of the gospel is embraced, which proclaims Christ to be the Son of God with power and great glory.

The foregoing is a very brief view of my opinion of the doctrine of Christ, and of one of the doctrines of men, which you are at liberty to read to your congregation, answer or neglect, as may best suit your circumstances and feelings. But remember while you and your orthodox associates thunder out damnation from your pulpits against liberal minded men, (who are fast increasing in this country) that your blast in the dark is a cowardly one; And you are unwilling to come to the light, or meet us in the field.

Dont think me your enemy because I tell you the truth, it is your insult, abuse, wickedness and errours which I am at war with, yet I love the man, and am prepared to meet you with civility and friendship. Your's &c.

Rev. TIMOTHY STOW. J. BADGER.

ON FORGIVENESS.

Forgiveness is a debt which we all owe, one to another. It is a requirement, which the God of love has enjoined on all men, as peculiarly adapted to facilitate the happiness of mankind, and preserve harmony and peace, among brethren. It enhances the happiness of man, by relieving him from a load of inveterate malice, hatred and revenge, by substituting in its stead, the peaceable fruits of righteousness, and the rich consolation, that flows from a course of well-doing.

It advances his happiness, in proportion as he values the reformation of the offender, to moral righteousness, honesty, sobriety and integrity. For, it is an experimental truth, that the forgiving of an enemy, will have more influence in retarding the progress of evil, in lessening the vices of society, than the execution of a thousand years, of the most studied and malignant revenge. "Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fufiling of the law. (Rom. xii. 20 21, and xiii 10.) Acts of kindness and benevolence, leave a more lasting impression on the memory, and have a more purifying operation on the soul, and consequently a greater effect in reclaiming men from the errour of their ways; than all the terrour our imaginations can suggest, or our cunning and art devise.

The voice of revelation, humanity and experience, inform us, that, to forgive is one of the noblest virtues, that exists in the breasts of mortals, and the one most conclusive to the felicity of all created intelligences. It expands the mind, and ennobles the best faculties of the human understanding. It creates affection among brethren, and harmony among all mankind. It begets reconciliation among enemies, joy in ourselves, and gratitude to the Giver of all good. It stands directly opposed to every principle of hostility, banishes all sectarian prejudices, and petty animosities, removes all ground of fear or suspicion, softens the heart into tenderness, and encircles the possessor in the arms of sympathy and love. It is that spirit, which lends a willing ear to the cause of suffering humanity, visits the abodes of poverty and distress, relieves the importunites, and, unasked the necessities of enemies as well as of friends—anxious to repress disagreement, and restore harmony and peace. If envy were ever admissible in the human breast, that person would first claim my attention, who readily forgives the most unqualified abuses, and resists evil, only with fraternal affection. This person, above all others, I should most envy, for his elevated situation and superiour wisdom enables him to escape the errours and follies, the weaknesses and imperfections of his associates. Such characters speak volumes to the understanding. Cheerfulness and harmony, love and peace surround them; and

the names of such illustrious worth shed a brilliant glory on their memories, imperishable as time, and as lasting as the source from which they emanated. Let us therefore, my brethren, endeavour to forgive; let us resist evil with good; let us cultivate the bonds of affection, that we may enjoy their fruits; be at peace with ourselves and our fellow nature, and be humble instruments of cultivating so glorious and praise-worthy a principle, in the hearts and minds of others. C. H.

SELECTIONS.

ORTHODOXY.

Mr. Editor,—*Sir*: I have frequently observed in your paper the word "Orthodox" prefixed to Denominations, Ministers, Societies, Sects, &c. &c. If you will please to describe in your paper what denominations, societies, sects, &c. are truly orthodox, and why they are entitled to the appellation, and also give the definition of the words Orthodox and Orthodoxy, you will very much oblige the

Illiterate.

When we use the word *Orthodox* no one we presume understands us to mean that the persons spoken of are believers in the *true faith* any more than when we employ the word Congregationalists we mean Universalists, though strictly speaking Universalists are as much Congregationalists as any sect in christendom. Words are often changed from their true meaning. It is so with orthodoxy. Originally it meant the true faith; now it is only a mere appellation, as insignificant as any other mere name, used to denote calvinism. The word *knave* once signified an honourable servant; but when servants got to be scoundrels, though they were still called knaves, the word changed in its signification according to the character of the persons to whom it applied. It is something so with "Orthodoxy" The word has become rather a term of reproach and even calvinists themselves do not seem to be very desirous of beingde signated by it.—*Ch Int.*

The following interesting account of the celebrated Whirlpool on the coast of Norway, was communicated in a letter from Capt. Doane, in 1824, to the late Hon A. B. Woodward, Judge of Middle Florida, and has been found among the many other papers he left on file. —*Gospel Luminary*

THE MAELSTROM WHIRLPOOL.

The wonderful phenomenon that has excited the wonder and astonishment of the world, I have seen. There are few of my countrymen who have had the opportunity, in consequence of the situation of it being remote from any port of commerce. Its latitude and longitude I do not exactly recollect. It is situated between two islands belonging to a groupe, off the coast of Norway, called Dovinstaff Islands: between Drontheim (being the most northern port of commerce) and the north cape. I suppose the latitude to be about 69 north; but will not be certain. I had occasion some years ago to navigate a ship from the north cape to Drontheim, nearly all the way between the islands, rocks and the main. On enquiring of my Norway pilot about the practicability of running near the whirlpool, he told me, that with a good breeze it could be approached near enough for examination without danger. I at once determined to satisfy myself. We began to near it about ten A. M. in the month of September, with a fine trading wind at N. West. Two good seamen were placed at the helm—the mate at the quarter deck, and all hands at their stations for working ship, between the night heads. I went to the main topsail yard with a good glass; I had been seated but a few minutes when my ship entered the dish of the whirlpool—the velocity of the water altered her course three points towards the centre, although she was going 3 knots through the water. This alarmed me extremely. For a moment I thought destruction was inevitable. She, however answered her helm sweetly, and we ran along the edge—the waves foamed around us in every form, while she was dancing gaily over them. The sensations I experienced are diffiicult to describe Imagine to yourself an immense circle running round, of a diameter of one and a half miles, the velocity increasing as it approximated towards the centre, and gradually changing its dark blue colour to white—foaming, tumbling and rushing to its vortex—very much concave, as much so as the water in a tunnel when half run out. The noise, too, hissing, roaring, and dashing—all pressing on the mind at once—pressing the most awful, grand, and solemn sights I ever experienced. We were near it about eighteen minutes, and in sight of it two hours. It is evidently a subteranean passage, that leads—the Lord knows where. From its magnitude, I should not doubt that instant destruction would be the fate of a dozen of our largest ships, were they drawn in at the same moment. The pilot says, several vessels have been sucked down, and that whales have also been destroyed—the first I think probable enough, but I rather doubt the latter. I have thus, sir, given you a lame but true account.

This world was never created for man to dwell in, but to pass through. Reason cannot teach us to regard our life in all its remote relations, but was bestowed upon us simply for the regulation of our duties here. When it wanders without the limits which nature has assigned, it becomes madness. Of one thing we are certain: we must die. Though reason shudder—though nature revolt—though pleasure sicken—yet no doubt can struggle, even into a momentary existence, concerning this termination of our career.

Poetick Department.

From the Chronicle of the Times.

THE WORN SAIL.

I saw a ship with streamers gay,
As proudly she went from the shore,
And she look'd like a maid on her bridal day,
As pompously decked in her gaudy array,
She danced the white waves o'er;

And her pennons floated high in air,
Or around her giddy masts clung.
The sea was full smooth and the wind was fair,
And the capstan's noisiest clang was there,
As she joyfully moved along.

The sun was shining all clear and bright,
Just gilding the ripples soft motion,
The sea-boy was perched on the shroud's lofty height,
And he whistled in glee, for his heart was light,
As she paced her way to the ocean.

The birds of the stream with delight were wild,
As they sportingly gambolled around her,
The sailors cheerfully sung as they toiled,
The breeze from the emerald surges blew mild,
And the tide set to where fate had bound her.

I stood, till the latest spar was fled,
As the horizon's arch closed o'er her,
And I thought as she sank in her watery bed,
That fortune its brightest enchantments had shed
In the passage that lingered before her.

As years rolled on the vessel came back,
But not in her gaudy array—
The wind blew high and the clouds were black,
And in gloom she cleaved the self-same track
Which she passed on her natal day:

The hands moved heavily o'er the deck,
The clink of the capstan was gone,
No flag floated proudly over the wreck,
Yet one generous sail, though reduced to a speck,
Still kept gently guiding her on.

And the sailors gave a horrid glare,
On the furiously dashing foam,
And they looked like men who had fed on despair,
Yet their only hope, the worn sail was there,
And it brought them in safety home.

And thus when toss'd with life's varying gale,
While fortune our canvass doth fill,
And all things are smiling, how blest, should they fail,
To find midst the tempest, like this poor shattered sail,
The friend who would cling to us still. HEF.

From the New Monthly Magazine.

ON A SAILOR'S FUNERAL AT SEA.

He is not where his fathers lie,
He sleeps not where they sleep—
His name a wreck of memory,
His dwelling place, the deep—
Down, mid unfathom'd gulfs he lies,

For he is gone where cave and hall
With coral garnished,
And darkness for their funeral pall,
Receive the ocean dead:
Where the sea-monsters have their home,
But man and sunbeams never come.

Grey was the dawn, and not a braid,
Curl'd on the billow's brow,
While on the deck the prayer was said,
And he was cast below,
Into the waveless glistening sea,
That closed above him tranquilly.

We watch'd the circle on the wave,
The dreary plunge had given,
And saw it widen o'er his grave,
And pass away, where heaven
Met the smooth waters' darker blue,
And blended their ethereal hue.

They wrapp'd no shroud his limbs around,
No bier sustained his form;
About the corpse its bed they bound,
Which oft in calm and storm,
The slumberer and the dreamer bore,
Who now shall dream and wake no more.

Sicken'd and sad we turn'd away,
From the sad sight of gloom:
The solitude of sea that day
Seem'd but one mighty tomb,
Burying all thoughts but thoughts of wo—
Asking who next should plunge below!

THE BRIDE MAID.

The bridal is over, the guests are all gone,
The bride's only sister sits weeping alone;
The wreath of white roses is torn from her brow,
And the heart of the bride-maid is desolate now.

With smiles and carresses she deck'd the fair bride
And led her forth with affectionate pride:
She knew that together no more they should dwell,
Yet she smiled as she kiss'd her and whisper'd—
"Farewell."

She would not embitter a festival day,
Nor send her sweet sister in sadness away:
She hears the bells ringing, she sees her depart,
She cannot veil longer the grief of her heart.

She thinks of each pleasure, each pain that endears
The gentle companion of happier years;
The wreath of white roses is torn from her brow,
And the heart of the bride-maid is desolate now.

A DREAM.

I saw a gem that sparkled bright,
Beneath the rugged sea,
I look'd around 'twas out of sight,
The gem was not for me.

I saw a rose among the flowers,
That shed sweet fragrance round,
I could have gazed for many hours,—
It withered on the ground.

I saw a youth in beauty shine,
The pride of all the place,
I saw his loveliness decline—
Deceit was in his face.

I saw the maid who lov'd him well,
To madness nearly driven;
She broken hearted, sighed farewell
And fled as 'twere to "Heaven."

I saw her laid within the bed
From which the dead ne'er rise;
I saw the tears that then were shed,
Like dew-drops from the skies.

I woke, and found it was a dream,
But sleep and me had parted;
'twas so much like what I had seen,
Alas! the Broken Hearted.

For who could love, and be deceived,
Without the wretched, bitter smart;
The pain of which is ne'er relieved,
'Till Death relieves the Broken Heart.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, APRIL 18, 1829. [NO. 8.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

VINDICATION OF UNIVERSALISM.

Delivered at Charlestown, Mass. Feb. 15, 1829.

BY L. S. EVERETT.

"And the Children of Israel heard say 'Behold, the children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, have built an altar over against the Land of Canaan, in the borders of Jordan, at the passage of the children of Israel:'—And when the children of Israel heard of it, the whole congregation of the children of Israel gathered themselves together at Shiloh, to go up to war against them."—Joshua xxii. 11, 12.

Under the administration of Moses, an agreement had been made, between the nine tribes and a half of the children of Israel, and the two tribes and a half mentioned in our text. By this agreement or alliance, the children of Reuben, the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, bound themselves to assist their brethren in gaining possession of the land of Canaan; and it was agreed, on the part of the nine tribes and a half, that when their common enemy should be subdued, the two tribes and a half should receive a certain portion of territory, and a stipulated proportion of the spoil, as a reward for their services. The alliance formed during the life of Moses, was strictly observed by both parties until his death; and when Joshua succeeded him, as the leader of the Israelites, and had obtained possession of the promised land, the contract expired, by its own limitation, and the two tribes and a half were discharged. They had faithfully served their brethren, and received the stipulated reward, accompanied with the blessing of the good Joshua.

By the united endeavours of the confederated tribes, the former possessors of the soil had been either dispersed or destroyed; and but little remained for them to do, but to enjoy the good of the land. The nine tribes and a half received their respective portions of territory on the west side of Jordan, by lot, and had already located the tabernacle of the Lord at Shiloh. When the two tribes and a half were about to depart to the other side of Jordan, the venerable Joshua, who was now stricken with years, called them into his presence to give them such advice as they might need. He affectionately reminded them of their faithfulness, and ingenuously acknowledged the important services they had rendered their brethren. The advice he gave them is couched in the following language—"But take diligent heed to do the commandment of the law, which Moses, the servant of the Lord, charged you, to love the Lord your God, and to walk in all his ways, and to keep his commandments, and to cleave unto him, and to serve him, with all your heart, and with all your soul." "So Joshua blessed them and sent them away."

"And he spake unto them, saying, Return with your riches unto your tents, and with very much cattle, with silver, and with gold, and with brass, and with iron, and with very much raiment; divide the spoil of your enemies with your brethren." After having received this advice, and the blessing of the good Joshua, "they departed to go unto the country of Gilead, to the land of their possession, whereof they were possessed, according to the word of the Lord, by the hand of Moses. And when they came unto the borders of Jordan, that are in the land of Canaan, the children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, built there an Altar by Jordan—a great Altar to see to. And the children of Israel heard say, 'Behold, the children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, have built an altar over against the land of Canaan, in the borders of Jordan, at the passage of the children of Israel:'—And when the children of Israel heard of it, the whole congregation of the children of Israel gathered themselves together at Shiloh, to go up to war against them."

Now the curious mind will find it somewhat difficult, at first, to account for the rashness of the children of Israel, as manifested in their gathering themselves together to go up to war against their brethren. For, as appears in the text, there was nothing to justify the measure but a mere flying report—a mere "hearsay." This was not the way in which our forefathers conducted themselves, when they declared war against the "mother country." All the "hearsays" in the world would not have called them to arms. Was it "hearsay," think ye, that led *our* sires to entrench themselves upon the hallowed spot in the rear of this house? Was it a mere report that produced the Declaration of Independence? Was it "hearsay that bared a thousand breasts to the

shafts of an invading foe, and led to victory the fathers and sons of freedom? Nay! They waited for the palpable proofs of a disposition on the part of the invaders to oppress and enslave them, before the blow was struck.

But, admitting that the report which came to the ears of the Israelites was true, it is difficult to account for the disturbance it created. Suppose the two tribes and a half *had* built an altar; what right had the Israelites to complain? They had just acknowledged their faithfulness—they had but recently given them a parting blessing; and no one pretended to have any farther claim upon them. If they had been disposed to build an hundred altars, it is difficult to conceive of any justice in the rash determination of their brethren to fight them for it.

But the secret is explained by the following facts. Moses and Joshua had both been very explicit in guarding the people against idolatry; and when the two tribes and a half were about to depart, Joshua, as before stated, charged them, particularly, to "take diligent heed to do the commandment of the law, which Moses, the servant of the Lord, charged them—to love the Lord their God, and to walk in all his ways, and to keep his commandments, and to cleave unto him, and to serve him, with all their heart, and with all their souls." Owing to a kind of jealousy not altogether peculiar to the Israelites, as soon as they "heard say" that their brethren had built an altar, they took it for granted that they had become idolators.—Notwithstanding their former amity, they at once assembled around their tabernacle at Shiloh, full of holy wrath, and resolved to go up to war against them. *Now*, all the ties of nature, consanguinity, and affection, were to be torn asunder—the abominable altar was to be torn down—and now, vengeance was to be taken upon these wicked idolators!

But, fortunately for both parties, some, more considerate and prudent than the rest, proposed to send the son of Eleazar the priest, accompanied with a respectable delegation of princes, ten in number, one from each tribe, to the two tribes and a half, to make certain enquiries touching the supposed apostacy. These delegates, supposing that all their surmises were founded in fact, approached them with great apparent zeal, and addressed them in the following severe and uncharitable manner—"Thus saith the whole congregation of the Lord, What trespass is this that ye have committed against the God of Israel, to turn away this day from following the Lord, in that ye have builded you an altar that ye might rebel this day against the Lord? Is the iniquity of Peor too little for us, from which we are not cleansed unto this day, although there was a plague in the congregation of the Lord, but that ye must turn away this day from following the Lord?—and it will be, seeing ye rebel to-day against the Lord, that to-morrow he will be wroth with the whole congregation of Israel."

It is surprising that men—and great men, too, should have introduced their business in this abrupt and unbecoming manner. They had nothing, as yet, to justify even a suspicion of idolatry, but a vague report—a mere "hearsay"—but they did not hesitate to accuse the two tribes and a half of several great crimes. They had not investigated the matter at all, but took up the report as they found it, and made the very worst of it they could. Now if the accused had acted as unwisely as their accusers, they would have had war at once: But fortunately they manifested a better spirit. Hear their reply.

Then the children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, answered, and said unto the heads of the thousands of Israel—"The Lord God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know—if it be in rebellion, or if in transgression against the Lord, save us not this day." Here was a solemn appeal, on the part of the accused, to the God of the Universe, in making which, they manifested an honest disposition. This must have placed the princes of Israel in rather an awkward and uncomfortable situation; for here was a solemn plea of "not guilty" against a mere "heresay!" How easy it would have been for the accused to have caused all these great men to blush at their own folly! They might have enquired,—Gentlemen, you have accused us of violating the law of God—of rebellion against our heavenly Father—and pray inform us of your authority for so doing. What could they have said? They could only say—our charges were founded on hearsay!"

But it may be asked—was there no truth in the report? Yes, it was true so far as this—they had actually erected an altar, but with views entirely different from what had been alledged against them. Let them speak for themselves. [Read verses 23—30.]

From this we discover, that the accused were, after all, actuated by the best of motives—motives which their accusers themselves, would have been the last to condemn. Their object was to worship God in their own way, and to perpetrate a remembrance of his name and his goodness, by erecting a temple which should serve to remind them of their obligations to him. They wanted something to take away the reproach from their children, and to remind them, that they, and their brethren, had been friends and worshippers of the same Jehovah.

Our minds are forcibly impressed with the conviction, that in many other cases, as well as in this, great evils have arisen from forming premature opinions—from judging hastily of the motives of others, or from placing too much dependence upon vague reports. If

mankind would seek for *information*, as zealously as they do for occasions to find fault with others, they would save themselves from a great deal of trouble. The Israelites, if they had taken a little time to consider, might have saved themselves from a great deal of anxiety, and many troubles, and some mortification. Instead of gathering themselves together, to go up to war against their brethren, they might have pursued their respective avocations peaceably, and happily, until, in due time, correct information could have been obtained, relative to the supposed wickedness of their brethren, and then all would have been well. But, probably, it taught *them* a good lesson; and *we* will endeavour to gain wisdom from the same event.

Every body knows—or, every body may know, that since a portion of the inhabitants of this country have seceded from the religious creeds and modes of worship of our brethren of other denominations, a great many reports have been circulated, which are quite prejudicial to the characters of the dissenters. We, brethren, who believe in God as the Saviour of all mankind, have been, and probably are yet, censured very severely, for our supposed apostacy from the true faith.—Very many "hearsays" are afloat in the world; and what is truly remarkable, "the whole congregation of the children of Israel" (that is, *modern* Israelites) have gathered themselves together to go up to war against us. Old animosities have been laid aside, old difficulties have been healed, and all the various sects and religious parties are now united and are engaged in preparations for a simultaneous attack upon all Universalists and Unitarians.

While reflecting on this subject my mind was forcibly struck with the coincident circumstance, that the whole strength of our brethren of the orthodox denominations, is brought to bear against two sects and a *part* of another. Reckoning ourselves as one sect, and our Unitarian brethren as the second, and claiming on the side of liberal Christianity, that portion of our Quaker brethren who have rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, and we have two and a half. Against these persons and their views much is said and done. And probably the proportion of our opponents, to the sects just mentioned, is as nine and a half to two and a half.

Leaving all others to defend their own views I shall notice only such reports as have been circulated with a view of producing a prejudice in the publick mind against our own faith and mode of worship. And,

First: The report has gone out, that the Universalists have thrown aside the bible, and will not be guided by its doctrines, or its precepts! This "hear say" has been accredited by thousands, and much unreasonable animosity has been produced by this foolish report. It may have originated in honest ignorance, or it may have been set afloat by design. Be that as it may, we all know that many very honest and good people have refused to hear the doctrine, supposing that its advocates rejected the testimony of the scriptures. Now if those who have "heard say" that we are thus foolish, would only come, in the spirit of religion, and enquire of us what our views on this subject are, the difficulty would soon be removed. We could convince any candid enquirer, that we take the bible for the man of our council, the guide of our conduct, and the record of our faith. That we claim the right to read and understand for ourselves, is very true—that we differ from others in opinion as to its import, is no less true; but this, by no means justifies the uncharitable report, that we throw it away. The two and a half tribes built an altar for themselves, but that was no proof of their apostacy. Those, therefore, who are so fond of stigmatizing us as deists and infidels, had better send a respectable delegation to ascertain the facts of this case, rather than persist in their offensive preparations to come up to war against us. And, no doubt, we could with great truth and sincerity exclaim in the language of our context: "The Lord God of gods," &c.

Another "hearsay" which has produced considerable commotion in the religious world, is, that the Universalists "deny the Lord that bought us." Great pains have been taken to circulate this report, and much hard feeling has been produced by it.

Now, if we take up this subject and examine the grounds on which this charge of apostacy rests, it will be found that *this* "hearsay" also, is unfounded. True, we cannot admit that the Son of Mary was the Creator of the Universe, nor that "God the mighty Maker died" on Calvary; but we would, nevertheless, render to Christ all the honour and respect he ever claimed. If we cannot adore his divinity, we can honour his humanity—and if we cannot worship him as God, we can reverence him as the Son of God.

But why should the whole congregation of Israel complain of us? Do we not profess to believe in, and adore the God of Jacob? Do not they do the same? Why, then, do they reproach us, while we agree with them in erecting our altars to the One God? What propriety is there in contending about the details, when we all agree as to fundamentals? A little investigation and inquiry would, perhaps, make an end of this hostility.

Again: The children of Israel have "heard say," that the Unitarians and Universalists are all agreed in sentiment, and that there is no difference but in name. Now, this also, is a mistake. We have no inclination to derogate, in the least, from the respectability of our neighbours, who are distinguished by their

belief in *one God.* We respect them as good citizens and good Christians; but so long as they cannot consent to be called by our name, we certainly do not wish to be called by theirs, to take away *our* reproach. When they openly profess the distinguishing tenet of our faith, we shall cheerfully claim them as our brethren; but, until then, they shall neither be honoured nor disgraced, by our consent, by being identified with us as a denomination. And if our opponents will take pains to examine the matter, they will find that, at present, there are but few feelings or views in common among these two sects. We, who advocate a pure, unconditional immortality, as the leading doctrine of Christianity, cannot consent to stop by the wayside, to contend about things of much less consequence; or rather, when abstractly considered, of no consequence at all. The doctrine of the divine Unity is of no other advantage than to lead our minds to admit the all-sufficiency of God's love and grace. And if there be any who would halt at the threshold, they are not of us. True, as far as they go, they walk the same road with ourselves; but while they stop to contemplate the gracefulness and benignity of the One God, we are striving to find, in the rich provisions of his grace and love, that which alone can satisfy the longing mind. While, therefore, our generosity would incline us not to disgrace our neghbours, our self-respect will lead us to claim no particular alliance with any, who, from conscientious motives or policy, desire to keep separate from us.

Again:—Another "hearsay" is, that since we have departed from the congregation of the Lord, we have become quite immoral, and extremely irreligious. And what has surprised me very much—a report of this kind has been heard from this very desk! Now, really, I am inclined to believe, from what I have seen, and from what I have heard, that there must be some mistake in this statement. At any rate it will be a mark of wisdom in those who have "heard say" that such is the fact, to look carefully into the matter. For one, I can truly say, I have seen this temple, erected to the living God—I have heard the joyful hymn of praise—I have witnessed the devotions of those who worship here—I have beheld the proofs of their sincerity; but I have seen nothing like a spirit of rebellion against God. May we all, my brethren, be enabled conscientiously to adopt the language of our context.

Another "hearsay" is, that believers in the unlimited goodness of God, deny the existence of any *hell!* This is truly an astonishing report. And what proof has been adduced to support this charge? A mere "hearsay"—for no man living ever heard a well-instructed Universalist deny the existence of as many hells as the bible teaches. If those who have long listened to this report, will take the trouble to examine the subject, they will find, that instead of denying the fact that there is a hell, we strenuously maintain that there are several. There is the hell from which David was delivered, is *one*—the hell into which all go at death, and from which our Saviour was delivered, is *two*—the hell, or Tartarus of the heathen is *three*—and the hell of fire in the valley of Hinnom, is *four!* Now "the Lord God of gods," knoweth, and the world *may* know, that we believe in all these hells. But if we are accused of denying the *eternity* of either, we plead guilty to the charge: for we know, and do testify, hell will be destroyed.

Another "hearsay" is, that we deny the personality of the Devil. In regard to this report, we are constrained to admit its truth. To the praise of our accusers be it said, we do not believe in an omnipresent, personal being, called the devil; and when we, as a body of professing Christians, erected an altar to the Lord Almighty, it did not enter our thoughts that we were bound by any divine command, to inscribe upon it the name of any such being.

Another "hearsay" is, that if the doctrine we believe be true, it gives loose to all the passions of the human heart, and requires not a well-ordered life and conversation. This report, if true, might justify our brethren of other denominations in their hostility to the great cause in which we feel so deeply interested. It is only by a full conviction that the "hearsay" is unfounded in fact, that we are induced to persevere in our efforts to spread the doctrine we profess. And, before the world, in the presence of that God who knows the heart, we do solemnly declare, that if our accusers will show us that our sentiments do produce, or can produce an excuse for vice or immorality, we will abandon the cause immediately.

Vice, immorality and irreligion, are evils which we honestly deprecate; and, as God is our Judge, we will not preach, nor countenance, nor support, nor believe a doctrine which will tend to perpetuate those evils.—"The Lord God of gods"—he knoweth, and Christians—they shall know, that our object is, to promote true religion and morality; and if our views, or a promulgation of them, can be proved incorrect, or detrimental to the peace and good order of society, we have only to be convinced of that fact, and our temples of worship shall be levelled to the ground, and our tongues shall be hushed in perpetual silence.

There are other reports, unfavourable to the cause which we have espoused, which might be noticed; but enough has been said on these particulars. We have only time for a few general remarks.

It is a source of much regret, and a cause

for deep humiliation, that Christians have so far departed from their duty, as to bestow their censure so freely upon their brethren who have differed with them in opinion. However just the censure may be, it is to be deplored, inasmuch as no good can result from severe treatment. But the evil does not lie altogether in the obloquy which is frequently thrown upon one Christian by another, or upon one society by another; but it consists in rashness and violence without a cause.

If we cast our eye upon the history of the Church, we shall find that but very few, if any, persecutions have arisen, where people have taken pains to examine, carefully and candidly, the opinions of persons accused of heresy; but when one body of men has persecuted another, it has been done without due consideration, and always without the shadow of an apology. And this is the case now in America.

Certain denominations had obtained an ascendancy over publick opinion, and were favoured with the confidence and respect of a large proportion of the inhabitants of this country. It will be recollected also, that our pilgrim forefathers fled from bondage and oppression, more intolerable than that endured by the tribes of Israel who have figured so largely in our present discourse. These Christians and their descendants, as before observed, have received a large share of publick respect and confidence; and, what is equally true, those who have never believed their doctrines have rendered them many essential services. Look at the history of this country—is it not a fact, that when our puritanical forefathers fled hither—when they came here, to this promised land, to find a secure retreat, where they might enjoy the rights of conscience; is it not a fact, that they were assisted by some who could not conscientiously subscribe to all their views? Who drove back the aborigines of our heritage? Who assisted in repelling their *civilized* foes? Who felled the stately forests? Who contributed to the erection of temples for the worship of God? Did not many assist in these things, who, in a religious point of view, were not particularly interested? There is now in this Commonwealth, if I mistake not, a law, by which any person, of any faith, may be compelled to pay for the support of a doctrine which he does not believe.

But the time has come when a portion of the Christian community think it their duty, and their privilege, to depart from their brethren, and erect an altar of love to the honour of the God of the Universe. They have received the blessings, and we hope the prayers, of their former friends; and now, why should they gather themselves together to go up to war against them? Why is the world filled with so many reports? Why are so many "hearsays" abroad in the Christian community?

We have but one favour to ask—all we desire is, that our Christian friends and neighbours will give our cause a fair and impartial hearing. That we are on one side of Jordan, and they on the other, is admitted—that we, as a body of Christians, have built an altar, is also confessed; but we fear that but very few of our present opponents have examined the motives by which we are actuated. Even while conscious of our innocence, we behold them in battle array—the tocsin has been sounded—the armour is put on—but, is it the armour of Love?

There is, brethren, a great and very important question before the world, and that question must be answered. It is: *Is God Almighty the Saviour of all men, or is he not?* Those who answer this question in the affirmative are few in number, comparatively speaking, but rapidly increasing. Arrayed against this sentiment, are nine twelfths of our Christian brethren, all Deists and Atheists, and all those who "care for none of these things." But, although those in the affirmative, are the minority, the question must be decided fairly and candidly. What shall be done? Our appeal to the law and the testimony must be solemn, sincere and heart-felt—our conduct must be open, kind, frank, and ingenuous—our deportment must be modest, humble and upright—our conversation must be pure, *and in heaven!* Then, if we are favoured with a blessing from on high, we shall prosper gloriously, and all the "hearsays" in the world will not retard our progress or disturb our peace.

That truth may finally triumph, may the Lord God of gods add his approval, and render us happy with the light of his countenance.

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

NO. VIII.

SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATION.

It is strange, that paying so great attention to the bible as all Christians do, they should be so ignorant of the true method of scripture interpretation. I did intend to give an enlarged view of this subject, but have been so long detained on some other particulars that I shall dismiss it with a few general observations.

To point out all the errours, common to scripture interpreters, would require more time and room than I can allot to so ungrateful a task. It will be enough to exhibit the true method.

We are to take up the bible as we do any other book. We are not to expect a particular meaning in every word. The style, though generally correct and precise, is still like the style of all writers—has its inacuracies. The language, though generally expressive, is not

devoid of looseness, and though generally clear, is not always without ambiguity. We are therefore to form our opinions according to its general tenour, rather than according to any particular passage. We are also to bear in mind that the bible was not all written by one individual nor indeed all written upon one subject.

The last remark will be found of much use. Were I wishing to explain the writings of Paul, I should show myself a novice, if I undertook to explain them by the writings of Joshua, unless indeed both were treating upon the same subject. If one writer says all are wicked, we are not to infer all mankind are wicked, unless indeed the whole world is the subject treated. If we wish to prove all mankind will be happy hereafter, it will be no proof to bring a passage which declares all shall be happy, unless the passage occurs in a discourse on future life. Should we wish to prove that a part will be eternally damned, a passage which declares the wicked shall be punished, will have no bearing, unless there be something in the passage itself, or its context which necessarily ties it down to a future world.

2. To understand the bible we must also consider the point the writer is endeavoring to prove, or the conclusion at which he aims to arrive. That conclusion is binding; the several points upon which he may incidentally touch may or may not be of authority, though generally to be disregarded, unless expressly proved or stated elsewhere. Allusions to particular opinions which are known to have then existed even when those opinions are not contradicted, are not to be taken as parts of Christianity, if not expressly stated in some other place.

A fact, which is or ought to be well known, that the economical mode of argument, as it was called, was extremely popular in the apostles' times, will justify this rule. It was customary then, and is so in some degree even now, for the controversialist to concede to his opponent all for which he contended except the very point in dispute. To illustrate this: It was the opinion of the Jews that by the transgression of Adam all his posterity became subject to death. This point you will find generally conceded. Particularly in the fifth chapter of Paul to the Romans, or rather Jews who dwelt at Rome. In this chapter Paul has one object in view, viz. that all mankind should, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, receive eternal life. "You Jews," he would say, "suppose that mankind became subject to death through Adam's transgression, or rather, through his disobedience, sin entered into the world and death by sin. Be it so. What then? The grace of God shall stretch beyond even this. This grace cancels all the damage received from the transgression of Adam, let that damage be great or small." Here it is perceived that Paul settles only one question, for this was the only question before him at the time. The other subjects incidentally alluded to, or points conceded, may nevertheless become subjects of controversy.

3. The sense of scripture language is to be considered as *one* in opposition to a double or two-fold sense, one literal and the other spiritual. This rule is often violated. It is not unfrequently we hear the most absurd doctrines pleaded on the authority of a hidden or spiritual sense of a passage. I once heard a man undertake to prove there were only three dispensations from the parable of three measures of meal; and many have argued that there were but four Gospels or memoirs of Christ, because there are four seasons in a year, four cardinal points, four dispensations, &c. Something like the man who undertook to prove that there could be only three parts in musick, base, tenor and treble, because there were only three persons in the Trinity.

I say but very little of the prophets. Their language, as the language of prophets is and always must be, is obscure. But the rule I have adopted, fixes their meaning to the subject on which they are treating. There may be types and shadows, but I do not understand them, and I have never seen any two who professed to understand them, that agreed in their view of them. When I read of Solomon's Temple, I read of a building which actually was erected. When I read the description of that Temple, I suppose I read a true description of real things, and am not aware that there is a spiritual meaning in every stone used in its building, or every timber, plank, board and other materials used in its construction.

A roving imagination may fancy images in the clouds, and persons of a certain temper, may see beings in the fire and fancy their acquaintances' health or condition from the arrangement of burning coals, but a sound mind, a chastened understanding will pay little regard to such ideal stuff. An ingenius mind, by the aid of his two-fold sense, may spin out many, very many fine theories from the bible. John Bunyan is an example. Any who can have patience to read his works, may have the substance and manner of what is called the "primitive Fathers." But such theories are like the spider's web—may hold weak animals but the strong will disregard it. When we read other books we understand them according to the most obvious sense of the words. We must observe the same rule with the bible. When we have determined a passage to mean one thing, we are to understand it as restricted to that thing.

4. As a general rule for understanding the scriptures, we are to regard, Who is the Speaker? what is the occasion on which he speaks? to whom does he address himself? and, what is the most obvious import of his discourse?

If we ask these questions and study diligently to answer them, we shall not fall into any material errours. We are told we must make the scriptures interpret themselves; that we must explain scripture by scripture. This remark is correct when understood in opposition to explaining by the analogy of faith, or by one's creed. But many, in attempting to explain scripture, are as inconsistent as the wag who said he could prove it right for a man to hang himself. For instance: Judas went and hanged himself—Go thou and do likewise. Or as the man who contended that the bible commanded all prophets to be hanged, because Jesus had said on these *hang* the law and the prophets.

We are indeed to explain scripture by scripture. But we are not to explain what is written on one subject by one writer, by what is written on another subject by another writer. As if we would explain a line in Shakspeare by a quotation from Brown's Philosophy on the human mind; or an obscure paragraph in some history by a line from an ode to the moon. If two writers treat the same subject they may throw light upon each other, or if the same writer speaks twice upon the same subject, both passages may be consulted with advantage.

The propriety of these rules may not readily appear to all my readers, and some may think they amount to nothing. We shall have occasion to refer to them before we get through our essay, their value will be tested and their usefulness will be evinced. We are now prepared for resuming the Trinity which we shall proceed to discuss.

AN ESSAY ON DIVINE GOODNESS.

NO. III.

The man who stabs his rival in the dark, or the one who procures the assassination of his enemy, suffers, is no doubt deeply miserable in consequence of the act. It were well if the suffering ended here. The rival perhaps had his friends—these may weep his death. The enemy may have been a useful member of society—society suffers his loss.

The drunkard destroys his own happiness—destroys his constitution, ruins his health, dooms himself to drag out a loathed existence, till he sinks into the grave unhonoured and forgotten. But the wretched consequences of his intemperance stop not with himself. He destroys the happiness of a virtuous wife, reduces her and a family of innocent children to want, to beggary and disgrace.

Wars no doubt originate in wickedness.—Their authours no doubt suffer; but wars involve the innocent as well as the guilty, in their destructive consequences. Sin brings misery. The sinner must always be miserable. But the sin of one man may destroy the happiness of thousands, or had ten thousand been innocent, his sin might have embittered their peace. Moral evil is the result of the misconduct of moral beings. The evil is not confined to him that does the wrong. It extends farther, and generally to all with whom he is connected. Why was such a state of things allowed? why was man made capable of thus destroying his own and the happiness of those with whom he is connected?

Before answering these questions we must look at man, ascertain what powers and faculties are allotted him, and what is the immediate cause of this destruction of felicity.

"The proper study of mankind is man;"—But we have been attempting to scan Jehovah, when we should have been studying ourselves. We are almost ignorant of the very rudiments of human nature, and can affirm but little concerning the principles of human action. One thing however is certain: man is an active being and is capable of doing whatever he wills to do, when no external cause prevents.

I am not about to lose myself in the intricate mazes of free will and necessity. I am not enquiring the guilt which may be attached to an individual, or the criminality of our actions in the sight of God. Such an enquiry belongs to another subject. I do not now ask whether man is good or bad in the sight of his Creator, but whether we have reasons sufficient to establish the position that God is good to his creatures. I do not follow the tract of the theologian, but would, if possible, discover one which the philosopher need not blush to pursue.

I said I was not about to lose myself in the intricate mazes of free will and necessity. I am not; and yet I cannot dismiss the subject without remark. Both the advocates of the one and of the other, are wrong or are right, just according to the light in which we view their remarks. If we say man has ability to pursue a correct course or always to perform those actions which will bring happiness to himself and others, regardless of the circumstances by which he is surrounded, we say wrong. If we say we are doomed by an irreversible law of Fate or predestination, to suffer all the misery there is in the world, without any ability to remove it, we say wrong. But if we say man is governed by the laws of nature, that is, the various objects with which he is surrounded act upon him, as well as he upon them, we say true. If we say man has the power to improve his condition, to lessen the evils he suffers and to enlarge his enjoyments, we say right.

The doctrine of free will, according to the views of most theologians, is only an imaginary notion, advocated for the purpose of making man guilty before God, to give God the right to punish, and it is upheld because we are fond of blaming those who do not act according to our wishes. In a theological sense,

I consider is not only false, but highly pernicious. It becomes a fruitful source of hard feeling and recrimination, and seems to authorize the cruel and arbitrary punishments so often inflicted upon those who do not please us, or upon those who do not bow with servility to one or many ycleped lawgiver or magistrates. We have fostered the notion that man is accountable for his actions; that whenever he does wrong it is through depravity or malice, hence we learn to hate him and pour upon his head the whole of our overflowing vengeance. This is no trifling evil; it is one which stands at the threshold of improvement and forbids entrance.

The doctrine of Fate or predestination, is no better. I never could approve of the *fatum* of the Stoicks, not only because it is generally impracticable, but because it seems to tell man "be still, every thing is fixed and it is useless to move." One may preach Fate and predestination to an army of ignorant soldiers on the eve of battle, or to a dying man, now no longer able to do any thing for himself or for others, but beware how you preach it to him who is capable of exertion and who ought to be engaged in active life.

Say to one depressed by the numerous ills of life, that his sufferings are unavoidable; that he must wait till the wheel of Fate revolves, before he can expect relief—tell him this, you augment his misery, destroy all exertion, and sink him in profound indolence to yawn out a wretched existence, in the vain expectation that some god may interfere in his behalf, and cause the sun of felicity to gild his habitation. Man is made an active being; and it would seem from what we can discover that he is constituted in some measure the artificer of his own fortune. We desire happiness. The immediate cause of our failure is not the stern decrees of Fate nor the maledictions of a malignant Deity. We act—but we act wrong; and this acting wrong is the immediate cause of our misery. Why do we act wrong? If we can discover any means by which we can exonerate Deity from being concerned in this, we may pronounce him good, at least not evil.

There have been various answers given to this question, some of them it will be well to note. "The irreversible laws of Fate or necessity," say one class. But the evil tendency of this answer has been already considered. If we admit it we remove no difficulty. If Deity is superiour to Fate, why does he subject us to a monster so cruel and unfeeling? If he is not superiour to Fate, then he is not God, or at least according to the notions of all Theists. This answer, if admitted, either plunges us in Atheism or charges our sufferings upon God. It is therefore rejected.

"The special Providence of God, who has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass," say another class. This answer charges our sufferings directly upon God. For, if our acting wrong be the cause of our misery, then God, if he cause us to act wrong, is certainly the cause of our suffering. Where then is his goodness? A good being cannot produce evil, and if God does, he is not good. "But men," the advocates of this notion alledge, "do wrong voluntarily. God ordained they should follow their own volitions and be miserable in consequence of following wrong ones." Very well. How came men voluntarily to do wrong? How came they by such dispositions? how came they to have such wills? If a wrong will be the cause of our going wrong, whence derived we this wrong will or what is its cause? Now this system supposes God ordains the means as well as the end. If he ordained one, he must the other on this plan. But had he not so ordered, that we should have these bad wills, he might have been greatly disconcerted in his arrangement. The scheme supposes, indeed, the will is free, but it supposes also that God, by his providence, has moulded it to the shape he wishes.

"God foreordains whatsoever comes to pass." If this be true, then every thing takes place according to his appointment. No matter how complicated the machine, no matter how many wheels within wheels, all are necessary, and each one must be under his control. If all the results depend upon the motion of a particular wheel, it would be folly to say the maker constructed the whole machine, and yet had no share in the wheel which gives motion to all the rest. All the results according to the plan before us, are made certain by the decree of the Almighty, and yet the least deviation or contrary motion of the will, would disconcert the whole. This plan is therefore rejected, because it makes God the efficient cause of our sufferings.

A third class attribute our acting wrong to the depravity of our wills. This is nearly allied to the one just dismissed. It supposes our wills are independent; that God will do them no violence. Our wills are wrong, hence we act wrong. We may have another link to our chain, but we have removed no difficulty. How came our wills to be depraved? This answer is none at all. It, under the appearance of assigning a cause, assigns only an effect. It declares acting wrong to be the result of depravity. May I not ask, is not depravity the result of doing wrong? How then can it be a cause? The answer is unsatisfactory. We must have another.

NOTICE.

The Black River Association of Universalists, will meet at Rutland, Jefferson county, N. Y. on the 2nd Wednesday and Thursday of June next.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

INFIDELITY.

We are not among those who are fond of troubling the publick with their private affairs. We dislike to complain to the publick of personal abuse or of injustice, which may be done to our individual self. What can be useful to our readers to know, we are always willing to tell; but we may often have our feelings deeply injured—we may receive shameful and cruel treatment from a brother—we might perhaps, by telling a pitiful story, excite a great deal of sympathy; but, right or wrong, we choose to keep such things to ourselves.

We are sensible that in this respect we differ from many of our brother editors. Some of these cannot have a personal pique against any one, nor fancy some personal allusion not quite so delicate as might be, but you hear them pouring their dolorous complaints into the publick ear, and in a strain, pathetick enough to make the trees weep, telling how they are persecuted, how many difficulties they have to encounter—what "perils from false brethren"—what pain of mind is occasioned by the "dereliction of a brother from honesty and integrity," &c.

Now we have suffered, and severely too, from those who called themselves our *particular friends*. No matter. We pitied and forgave. We are not ambitious to be thought likely or willing to obtain the crown of martyrdom. One thing however is proved by all past experience, that whoever will boldly step forth to defend oppressed humanity, and to pour the light of truth into the long benighted mind, will have to listen to the growlings of bigotry and to feel the shafts of persecution. He who is not prepared to stem the torrent of popular clamour and sectarian invective, is not prepared to be a reformer. He had better remain in obscurity, or mingle with the multitude and lose himself in the crowd.

About four years since, the editor of this paper renounced his connection with the Presbyterians, turned from the prospects which that connexion presented, and joined, with all his heart and with all the energies of intellect he possessed, the incipient cause of Universalism, then struggling hard for a little notoriety. He may have advanced that cause—he may have been useless. Few men have laboured with more industry or sacrificed more hours when rest was desirable, than he has, to aid the cause which he believed was dear to every philanthropist. His motives have been impugned; men have presumed to judge his heart—to misrepresent his feelings, and to torture his sentiments into frightful monsters, that his influence might be unfelt and his benevolent exertions useless. No matter. It is no more than a careful observer might have expected. He has received this too from those who call themselves Universalists. But still it is no matter. We should be unwilling to admit we lacked courage to meet what greater and better men have met before us.

There is only one point of view in which we are affected. We regret that our usefulness must be curtailed by the opposition of those who should be our friends, but who could treat us no worse were they our bitter enemies. But we have been taught to look upon the world with the eye of a Christian and of a philosopher. As a philosopher, we attribute it to their ignorance, and feel still more determined to persevere in our course. As a Christian we can compassionate and forgive, find tranquility for our own bosom and a desire to communicate it to others.

These remarks have been extorted from us at this time by two or three articles which appeared in the seventh No. of the Gospel Herald, a professedly Universalist paper published in New-York. These articles come from a professed *friend* and are pregnant with a sort of friendship we cannot prize very high, nor find it in our heart to return. They breathe what the editor calls a *Christian* spirit, to which we shall make no objections, if he will add to the word the slight prefix of *anti*. One article teems with personal abuse, that is answered in another place. The other, or the one we notice now, is an attack upon our sentiments with an attempt to prove we are strongly infected with infidelity. In one, he would tell the publick, the Editor of the Gospel Advocate is a *malicious* scoundrel—a base *calumniator;* in the other, that he has deviated from "honesty and integrity—very nearly denied the existence of Almighty God, and still more nearly, if possible, the truth of divine revelation;" and, after charitably bestowing the honourable cognomen of "*fool*," he concludes we must be rebuked for our temerity.

Now we shall not reciprocate any of these favours.—We know not whether Mr. Fisk has any conscience or moral sense, except *policy*; if he has, we would give it one hint. We are *not* ignorant of his *private* views. But, as we suppose he wishes them to be private, we shall not give them publicity. With us, it is a maxim to advance no sentiment we do not believe. We have not told *all* we believed, but shall continue giving our opinions to the publick, as long as we think we can be useful by so doing. Long before we became a Universalist, we determined we would never hesitate to tell our honest convictions, and we have made it a rule, never to advance a sentiment that we felt ourself unable to support. If Mr. Fisk does not believe our sentiments, we think it more honourable, not to say christian, to show them false, than to give them frightful names. We cannot thank him for naming our children; it is a privilege we claim to ourself, and we think it will be enough for Mr. Fisk to name his own.

There is more sound than dread in the terms, "atheist" and "deist." They have been so liberally applied by one party to another, by one man to another, when he was unable to disprove his sentiments, that we receive the application of them to ourself, rather as an acknowledgement on the part of Mr. Fisk that our sentiments are incontrovertible. We feel rather honoured than otherwise, by the use he has made of these terms. Should he call us "Infidel," we should pity him, but should scorn to resent it.

He has however made a few garbled extracts from our writings which he whines over with a doleful plaint—says he has been sorely pained. He had better not look at them again. We dislike to be the cause of pain to any one. He has never read our writings, or we presume he has not; if he has, we can pay but a poor compliment to his honesty or his discernment. The inferences he has drawn are a libel on logick and a gross caricature of reasoning.

He says we "very nearly deny the existence of Almighty God, and still more nearly, if possible, the truth of divine revelation." What is the proof he has to offer? Why, in the Gospel Advocate, edited by L. S. Everett, there was an article signed "O. A. B." which denies that our afflictions come from God. This is not exactly correct. The article to which he alludes denies with strong language, and we believe with strong reasons too, that our *sufferings* come from God. Mr. Fisk thinks "O. A. B." is an Atheist, or to say the least, a Deist, because he does not believe that God is the authour of all the evil, of the pain, iniquity, &c. there are in the world. This is a heavy charge. But we cannot believe that a good being will make his children miserable. If Mr. Fisk thinks so, he is welcome to his thoughts, but we should like to know in what such a Being's goodness consists.

The next charge, is, that the same "O. A. B." denies the *justice* of punishment. "O. A. B." in the first place admits ALL for which T. Fisk or any other Universalist contends, viz. that pain may be inflicted on an individual for that individual's reformation or benefit. But "O. A. B." denies that the infliction of pain for the benefit of a person, is *punishment*, and as he, with all Universalists, denies that God can inflict pain for any other purpose, he denies that God can justly *punish*. The controversy is purely verbal. "O. A. B." discovered the word *punishment* was an orthodox term, invented to express an orthodox notion, which notion he rejects, and with it, he thought best to reject the term by which that notion was expressed. If Mr. Fisk is attached to the term, he may keep it, though we sincerely hope he may never find the notion it conveys to be true.

His third proof is about some philosophical notion, but as he seems ignorant of philosophy and determined to remain so, it would be useless replying. If our readers wish to know our views of philosophy, they are referred to the Essayist No. 9. Gospel Advocate, Vol. 6. It is the article from which Mr. Fisk has extracted two phrases, to prove it probable that "O. A. B." did not believe in a future state of existence. "O. A. B." expresses himself without any ambiguity on the subject. He carries the idea that the affairs of another world are matters of *faith*, and not of knowledge. For our views and feelings respecting a future world the reader is referred to the articles under the head "Christianity," signed "A Believer." The articles have appeared in the present volume, and will speak for themselves. So much for the charges against "O. A. B." Now comes the charges against the Editor.

He first accuses us of ignorance. We say in the first No. of our Essay on divine Goodness, "Nature is wonderful—wonderful because we know not how it came nor how it is supported." Mr. Fisk thinks there is something still more wonderful, viz. that a "Minister of the gospel" should have the assurance to make such acknowledgement. No doubt this appears wonderful to Mr. Fisk. He is so little in the habit of acknowledging himself ignorant of any thing that he is filled with wonder that any one else should. Now *he* may know how the world came, but we do not. *He* may know how it is supported, we do not. And we are inclined to think if he knew a little more, he would not seem to himself to know quite so much.

But again he says we "affirm there is nothing in Nature to prove the existence of a God." Now as ill-luck will have it, we have never affirmed any such thing, but directly reverse. In reviewing our article from which these extracts were taken, we discovered a slight inaccuracy in the use of the word "prove," but the meaning of the writer is so clearly stated near the conclusion of the article, that we know not by what gentle name to call Mr. Fisk's assertion in reference to our views. We cannot call him *honest*, unless we call him ignorant, but as most men would rather be called knave than fool, we shall not call him by the latter. We quote the conclusion of our remarks on the existence of God.

"I see nothing in nature which appears able to *originate* the idea of a God in my mind. But since revelation informs me there is a God, every thing in nature bears testimony to its truth. Revelation *originates* the idea, Nature *proves* it, but could not of itself have taught it." This looks something like Atheism and denying the bible or divine revelation! This Essay is intended to prove the goodness of God; we must have been a consistent reasoner indeed, to attempt to prove the goodness of a Being we did not believe to exist! When we are guilty of such folly, we will shake hands with Mr. Fisk and call him brother.

Mr. F. attempts to prove there is a God, we mean he attempts to prove it from Nature. He says what nobody will deny, "every thing that is made implies a maker." Very good, what is the conclusion? Let us reduce his reasoning to form. Every thing that is made implies a maker. The world was made. Therefore the world has a maker. Very well, how does Mr. F. *know* the world was made? Let him prove this and his conclusion will be correct. "Every effect argues a cause." We grant it. Prove the world is an *effect* and he will advance in his argument. Now this he cannot do from *Nature*. He says there can be no effect without a cause. We grant it. But this will not help him unless he can prove that *nothing* can exist without a cause. If he proves this we shall turn his own weapons against him, or ask him what was the cause of the first cause. This will place him in a situation from which he can extricate himself only by admitting a cause prior to the first cause or denying that any thing exists. If he admits one thing can exist without a cause, he gives up the argument. If one thing can exist without a maker how does he know but another may? Where is his argument? Now we say there is a God who created the world. We say it

because God himself has made this communication. Nature bears testimony to its truth, or strengthens the assertion. But enough. We have some regard for Mr. Fisk. We think he has some talents and we are willing he should exert them. We however think he had better not rush upon too deep subjects, for fear he may lose himself. He accuses us of dishonesty but as his *accusation* does not make us so, we forgive him.

GOSPEL HERALD.

We regret the circumstances which have occasioned an unpleasant controversy with the above named paper. But, as we are not conscious of having deviated from propriety and even necessity, we make no apology for laying before our readers a plain statement of facts. We do this because Mr. Fisk, in replying to our charges against him, has appealed to the sympathy of our readers, and probably sent the number containing his complaints, to as many of our patrons as he could ascertain.

Mr. Fisk complains that we withheld our paper and pours upon us for this his accustomed abuse. We can if necessary prove that every one of our numbers except the sixth has been regularly mailed, and the number containing our animadversions on his conduct, was sent not only when it first came out, but for fear he should not get it, we some days after mailed it again. But we cannot thank him for sending us his paper containing a reply to us. We received the No. but are not indebted to the editor for it—we received it by the politeness of a friend in New-York. We are willing Mr. Fisk should see all we write, we intend some of it for his benefit. We shall send him this number, and if he sends us his from the third number we shall continue to exchange, if he does not we shall strike him from our list. He complains that the letter we published was anonymous. We have the name in our possession and it is a name too that will give weight to the charges. When Mr. Fisk gives the names of those who wrote the letters from which he extracts, we may publish this name.

Mr. Fisk charges upon us as a crime, "being enticed from obscurity and raised to the editorship." Now we frankly confess we were born in obscurity, that we were nursed in the humble vale of life, but we have never felt guilty on that account. If by becoming an editor our head is turned and we are somewhat giddy, Mr. Fisk should understand that after, adding the dignity of his talents to elevate the office, he ought to make some allowance.

He makes many other accusations, the best no doubt he could invent. They have not disturbed the tranquility of our mind, for we deemed them harmless—the proofs no doubt of his *friendship*. But we pass lightly over them. We wish well to Mr. Fisk and certainly have too much respect for his reputation as a man and as a writer to comply with his request to publish his letter to our readers. If however he insists upon having it inserted he may publish this article and what is added by Mr. Doubleday, and we will reciprocate the favour. As we are determined not to quarrel with Mr. F. we intend that nothing more shall be inserted on this subject than what appears in this number. The following remarks from the publisher speak for themselves. They show who is to blame or whether we are persecuting Mr. Fisk. ED.

REMARKS BY THE PUBLISHER.

As the subject of controversy with the Rev. T. Fisk, effects no one but him and me, I have concluded to take on myself the responsibility of answering his appeal to the sympathies of my patrons, which appeared in the seventh No. of the Gospel Herald. I wish neither the columns of the Advocate nor the attention of its editor, to be occupied with subjects foreign to the main design of the paper, if possible to avoid it.

Mr. Fisk addresses himself to our readers and complains that we have slandered him. The facts stated in our 4th number, are easily substantiated, and that too mostly by his own admission. If these impeach his character, it is his fault not ours.

He admits that he was engaged in the publication of the Advocate, and that he became pledged not to be concerned in any other paper, "while Mr. Everett continued to be its proprietor." I have paid Mr. Everett a large sum for his property in the Advocate, and for all his rights relating to it; and it must have been a very singular arrangement, by which Mr. Fisk was to do nothing to its detriment while in the hands of Mr. Everett, but might be allowed to injure it with impunity in the hands of a bona fide purchaser.

I am confident that Mr. Everett never understood the arrangement in a sense so subversive of the principles of common justice. But allowing Mr. Fisk his own interpretation, he violated his pledge in a few weeks after he gave it. Scarcely had he left Mr. Everett's presence, when he flooded the country with proposals for a paper to be entitled Plain Truth, to be edited by himself, and to be published at Buffalo. This act was considered at the time by those concerned, as a violation of his pledge. Why then does he consider our statement of his subsequent transactions, as an impeachment of his character?

He says that he did not, "sell the Advocate, he gave it away." Mr. G. Tuttle, since deceased, told a very different story. But let us look at this in view of Mr. F.'s own statement. The right he had in the Advocate arose chiefly from his services in travelling and procuring subscribers.

He admits that he "was paid as an Agent," but not as a partner. Here is a distinction without a difference. He travelled through the western states and procured several hundred subscribers. Many of them paid; many have proved irresponsible. For each he received a premium far beyond the profits of a yearly subscription, (if inevitable losses are taken into the account) and proportioned to the

permanent advantages that were expected to accrue to the paper. Supposing then, that he acted only as an agent, is it *just* for him to endeavour to turn to his own advantage the patronage which Mr. Everett paid him for procuring, and for which I have paid Mr. Everett?

Let me not be misunderstood. Whatever were Mr. Fisk's pledges, I never should have complained of his simply publishing a paper in New-York, had he not taken advantage of his former connexion with the Advocate, of our published list of agents, and of an *apparent* reduction of price, to introduce his paper at the expense of ours. He knows very well there are but few persons, who are willing to take more than one religious paper, and altho' he disclaims, as "disreputable" to him, any intention to injure the Advocate, his acts speak a very different language. His first Notice of the Advocate stating the removal of Mr. Everett, and omitting to mention even the name of his successor, whilst he was asking courtesies of us, and pressing for the admission of his Prospectus into our columns, his insidiously sending his Proposals to all our Agents, informing them in staring capitals, that he would furnish them a paper fifty cents cheaper than the Advocate, (the difference in size was not likely to attract attention) and finally addressing his last appeal directly to our readers, instead of his own, all tend to contradict his professions.

I shall not give a name to his conduct in taking advantage of our published list of agents. I might have prevented the injury by suppressing the list, and perhaps ought to have done it on the same principles that men bar their doors and windows. But I submit it to those acquainted with newspaper affairs, whether his conduct in this respect would have been honourable even in a professed enemy.

I say nothing about friendship, sentiment, brotherly love, and such kind of phrases which Mr. Fisk knows how to handle with peculiar adroitness. If a man says he is my friend, I only ask him to act agreeably to his professions. Nor do I say ought against Mr. Fisk's general character, nor do I say he is a bad man; I only say that he has acted wrong in certain particulars.

He says we should have appealed to a convention or expostulated with him privately. He knows there is no convention that has cognizance over the western associations, and the injury he was doing us would have been fully consummated, before any redress could be obtained, by any other method than the one we adopted. But I have other ground of complaint against him, not yet noticed in the Advocate. I have written to him twice, and expostulated with him in a friendly manner—I have received no answer, no satisfaction. Does he wish me to appeal to a Universalist Convention?

The fourth No. of the Advocate was sent to Mr. Fisk as soon as published, and remailed at a later period, as he appeared not to have noticed it.

His attack on Mr. Brownson only shows, that his highly sentimental feelings are somewhat tinctured with malevolence. He requests *me* to publish his appeal, to our readers, but I presume he has no intention to reciprocate the favour. If he will publish this in the Herald, I have no doubt Mr. Brownson will publish in the Advocate any remark he may choose to offer if couched in temperate language, so as not to disgust our readers or do discredit to the writer. But, having given a fair statement of facts, any thing he may say in reply will probably receive no further attention.

U. F. DOUBLEDAY.

Mr. Russel Canfield is assured that, if we have done him injustice, we are ready to correct it. If our information was incorrect, he has but to tell us in what particulars, and all shall be rectified. But as long as he speaks in the manner he does in the letter addressed to us in the seventh No. of the Gospel Herald, we shall leave him unnoticed. EDITOR.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

ORTHODOXY AND PAGANISM.

Strange that the Heathen are so inconsistent! What absurd, foolish and cruel notions! But stop—art thou a Christian? And dost thou believe the doctrine of endless misery? If so, talk not of the absurdities of heathenism. Art not thou a Heathen thyself? What idea, or what notion ever entered the brain of a Heathen, more absurd, more cruel, than the doctrine of endless misery for thy fellow creatures? Thou thinkest it strange, that the Heathen suppose their Deities require bodily pains to appease their wrath; and yet thou thinkest, that nothing short of infinite endless torments will glut the vengeance of thy God.

I have thought, Mr. editor, as some time has elapsed since I have appeared in the Advocate, I would give you something respecting that which I hear the most about.

I have been reading a history of the Hindoos. Have heard considerable orthodox, or Calvinistick preaching, (for we seldom have the gospel preached in Elbridge,) and cannot but be struck with the similarity of the two doctrines. Not long since we had a striking description of an angry God, and an endless hell, by an orthodox clergyman, in this place. A notice was previously given that a discourse was to be delivered on a very important subject. The subject to be discussed, was represented to be very trying to the preacher. A special prayer meeting was called, for the purpose of praying, that the discourse about to be delivered might have the desired effect on the minds of those who heard it. By inquiry I was

unable to ascertain what the discouse was to be upon. Sure, thought I, the minister must have something very special. To satisfy my curiosity, I attended. The text were the words of the Saviour, "and if thine eye offend thee pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God, with one eye, than having two eyes, to be cast into hell fire."

It was taken for granted, that a fiery hell now existed some where.—I do not recollect that he mentioned where it was located; except it was in the future world. But such a place now existed. It was represented as being enclosed with very high walls, in which millions and millions of damned souls were cast; immortalized by the author of their existence—where they were to suffer through the endless ages of eternity. The walls of this place were represented to be so high, that these wretched objects might rise and rise, ascend and ascend hundreds and hundreds of years, e'er they could arrive at the top of hell-fire; and should they arrive, the walls were still higher—they could not escape. The inhabitants of this place were represented as pleading and pleading, and entreating for an escape—pleading that they might die and be no more—pleading that they might be annihilated and struck out of existence, that their sufferings might cease. But no: the power of Almighty God, whose arm is strong, keeps them in existence that he might forever pour out his fury and indignation upon their devoted heads. And, while they were thus pleading and begging for deliverance or annihilation, they were "thrust down with redoubled fury to endure forever the gnawings of the worm that never dies."

It was stated that these wretched creatures would be consumed—would die and be no more, agreeable to their prayers, were it not for the powerful arm of Almighty God, who keeps them in being, who immortalizes and sustains them that they cannot die, but continue dying, dying, and yet never die.

To make this scene appear more awful, its inhabitants were represented as groaning, shrieking, crying; children cursing their parents for neglecting their duty towards them while here on the earth; parents cursing themselves for their folly, and blaspheming the name of that God who gave them existence. Their sins and their blasphemies were to continue as long as God should exist. There, brothers were cursing fathers, mothers, sisters and brothers. There, sisters were cursing brothers, fathers, mothers and sisters. All, all who were dear to each other here on earth were cursing each other, and continually sinning and adding *sin to sin*, and forever blaspheming the author of their existence, while they were forever to ascend and descend into the bottomless lake of liquid lava. Yes, "thrust down with redoubled fury." O how sublime! Equal to the sublime nonsense of Milton concerning the fall of his polluted Angels.

As this hell is enclosed with high walls, and the inhabitants therein ascend and descend, that which causes their torment must be a kind of lava or liquid hell-fire, similar to some of the heathen hells.

The heathens have their different hells.—Some consists of "boiling oil," others of "burning metal," others of "liquid fire," probably a mixture of brimstone, and probably Mr. Stow's hell consists of all the materials of which all the heathen hells are composed. It would seem so at least from the circumstance of the ascending and descending of its miserable victims.

As a further description of God's character, this hell was represented as daily receiving its victims by hundreds, who were continually dropping there—that many precious souls were now standing on its precipice, while the Almighty, with his arrow of death, with his bow bent, the angel of mercy pleading in the sinners behalf to stay his arrow a little longer, a little longer, if peradventure the sinner may surrender—but no, he still persists in his opposition. The Almighty lets fly the arrow at the sinners heart—he dies; he falls; he sinks to dwell throughout eternity with devils and damned souls. He now pleads for deliverance, for death, for annihilation. But alas! alas! all is in vain!! O shocking description! Blasphemy! Disgrace to the Christian religion! Perversion of the gospel! and of the character of God! Having given the character of the God of Orthodoxy, their hell, and its inhabitants, according to Mr. S's description, though not perhaps in the precise words, but the substance of the representation, we now turn our attention to that of the heathens.

"The wicked," says the history of the Hindoos, "have 688,000 miles to travel to the palace of Yumu (a God of theirs) to receive judgement." But the wicked, according to the Orthodox account, sink immediately in hell by the arrow of their God; that is, at death.—But to proceed. "In some places they pass over a pavement of fire; in others, the earth in which their feet sink is burning hot; or they pass over burning sands, or over stones with sharp edges, or burning hot: sometimes showers of sharp instruments, and at others showers of burning cinders, or scalding water, or stones fall upon them; burning winds scorch their bodies; every now and then they fall into concealed wells, full of darkness, or pass through narrow passages filled with stones, in which serpents lie concealed; sometimes the road is filled with thick darkness; at other times they pass through the branches of trees, the leaves of which are full of thorns; again, they walk over brokon pots, or over hard clods of earth, bows, putrifying flesh, thorns, or sharp spikes; they meet tygers, jackals, rhi-

noceroses, elephants, terrible giants, &c.; and in some parts they are scorched in the sun without obtaining the least shade. They travel naked; their hair is in disorder; their throat, lips, &c. are parched; they are covered with blood or dirt; some *wail* and *shriek* as they pass along;" (similar to the shrieks of the miserable objects of Mr. Stow's hell.) "others are weeping; others have horror depicted on their countenances; some are dragged along by leathern thongs tied round their necks, waists, or hands; others by cords passed through holes bored in their noses; others by their hair, the ears, the neck, or the heels; and others are carried, having their heads and legs tied together. On arriving at the palace, they behold *Yumu*, clothed with *terrour*, two hundred and forty miles in height; his eyes distended like a lake of water, of a purple colour, with rays of glory issuing from his body; his voice is loud as the thunders at the dissolution of the Universe; the hairs of his body are each as long as a palm-tree; a flame of fire proceeds from his mouth; the noise of the drawing of his breath is greater than the roaring of the tempest; his teeth are exceedingly long, and his nails like the fan for winnowing corn. In his right hand he holds an iron club; his garment is an animals skin; and he rides on a terrifick buffalo. (You will perceive, Mr. Editor, that this description is as sublime as Mr. Stow's or Milton's.) "Chitru Gooptu also appears as a terrible monster, and makes a noise like a warriour when about to rush to battle. Sounds terrible as thunder are heard ordering punishments to be inflicted on the offenders. At length *Yumu* orders the criminals into his presence, and thus addresses them:—"Did you not know that I am placed above all to award happiness to the good, and punishment to the wicked? Knowing this, have you lived in sin? Have you never heard that there are different hells for the punishment of the wicked? Have you never given your minds to religion? To-day, with your own eyes, you shall see the punishment of the wicked.—From yoogu to yoogu stay in these hells. You have pleased yourselves in sinful practices, endure now the torments due to these sins. What will weeping avail? Yumu next directs Chitru-Gooptu to examine into the offences of the criminals, who now demand the names of the witnesses: let such, say they, appear and give their evidence in our presence. Yumu, smiling though full of rage, commands all the elements of nature, and the divisions of time to appear against the prisoners, who, hearing the evidence, are struck dumb, and remain trembling and stupified with fear. Yumu then, gnashing his teeth, beats the prisoners with his iron club till they roar with anguish; after which he drives them to different hells."

The God Yuma beats the prisoners with an "iron club." Mr. Stow's God shoots with bow and arrow. The one, it seems, is a ruffian, the other a savage! The heathen have their different hells. The prisoners suffer a long time, though limited. Mr. S's hell is one, but very large, and very high walls. Its prisoners suffer, not a limited time, but eternally! Suffering without end—never, never to be released or annihilated! And to give his hearers a more striking sense of the duration of endless punishment, he calls on them to "number the hairs of their heads, and let each count one hundred years, and when this period has passed away this will not be eternal punishment. He then says, go number the sands on the sea shore, and let each grain number one hundred years until the whole is numbered, and this will not be eternal punishment. He then bids go take from the sun a particle once in one hundred years, until the whole is numbered, this will not be eternal punishment.—The damned in hell will still suffer one continual round through eternity!" This was the substance of that preaching which was so necessary to be believed, and for which prayers were offered, that it might terrify and overawe the ignorant and vicious. The priest of the heathen make use of their hells in the same way. And who inflicts all this misery of which the Orthodox say so much about? They tell their hearers 'tis God. That God who "is love," and that "love" inflicts it for the "display of his glorious attributes!!" What blasphemy!! What impiety! Can Mr. Stow paint to his imagination a blacker character than the one he ascribes to that God who is "love"—who is infinite in love? He certainly cannot.

Let Mr. Stow paint to his imagination a character, call it devil; an omnipotent one; the blackest and the most malignant that his imagination can conceive, or his pencil paint, and I pledge myself to make it appear from his sermon, and from the writings of his Calvinistick brethren, that the character which he ascribes to that Deity is equally as bad. A few quotations is sufficient.

First, then. "Man is blinded by the will and commandment of God."—Calvin.

2. "Reprobates are absolutely ordained to this twofold end: to undergo everlasting punishment and necessarily to sin, and therefore to sin that they might be justly punished."—Piscator.

3. "The sight of hell-torments will exalt the happiness of the saints forever."—Emmons.

This is all that is necessary; and a belief of this stuff, is called Christianity! O, Calvinism! O, Orthodoxy! thou art mad! Ye talk of heathen cruelties and absurdities! and devour widow's houses," under the pretence of enlightening the heathen! Yes, the cry is like the horse-leach. Give—give money, money, money! This is your alpha and omega. You get it, and the more you get, the less it

seems to satiate your devouring maw. Ye want money to save them from their imaginary hells? No, but to save them from yours, and convert them to your absurdities! Strange that men of sense should thus degrade themselves!

More of this when I get time.

Yours, A. C.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO JAMES LUCKEY, ESQ.

Dear Sir:

After an absence of some years, I was gratified, to meet and renew my good feelings to one whom I ever considered as a valued friend. I was happy to see you at your house, and though our sentiments on some points of theology were different, there was the same reciprocation of good feeling which I trust we had formerly indulged towards each other.

Our conversation, you recollect, was on the goodness of God, and the final salvation of all men. I stated, what I believed, that the goodness of God must be given up, or the conclusion admitted that every individual He has created, will be, finally, a gainer by his existence. You admitted and contended for the goodness of God, as well as myself, but considered my conclusion not necessary, because, that the goodness of God allowed evil to exist at present. That is to say, if God can be good and allow evil to exist to-day, why may he not be good, and allow it to exist to-morrow? According to your request, and to my promise, I now proceed to show, wherein I think your reasoning incorrect, and also to give you some farther evidence of the correctness of my own.

There are, sir, some points, in which we agree, or at least, if not, I shall on my part, concede. The point in dispute, is easy to understand. It was started by an argument used in my sermon, which you was so good as to hear. I was labouring to prove the salvation of all men. I argued it from the goodnes of God. God is a good Being, as such he cannot make his creatures misererable, nor allow them to suffer, if he has the power to make them happy. He has the power to make them happy, he therefore will. This was my conclusion, to which you objected. It is not necessary to infer that all mankind will be happy, because God is good. God *is* good, but he does suffer his creatures to be miserable. If my conclusion were true, mankind would be happy now. But as they are not all happy now, my conclusion, you say, is contrary to *fact*, and therefore is incorrect. This is the argument on both sides. I admit the fact for which you contend, but also contend that if you urge it against my conclusion, it will destroy either the power or goodness of God. The object of the controversy is to reconcile the goodness of God with the existence of evil. I say that his goodness cannot be maintained unless we suppose its termination in good. You say it need not thus terminate, because God who is good, allows it to exist. You will now perceive where we differ. I assume the position, that the existence of evil, is an objection to the goodness of God, unless we look to its termination. You assumed the position, that God is good, and that evil is no objection to his goodness, because he is good. Yours, I admit, is a common, and not an inconvenient kind of logick; but, to me not wholly correct.

Suppose, sir, we try this mode of reasoning. You admit that it is wrong to murder, or that murder is an evil. Suppose, then, a man whom you had always considered a good man, should be arraigned for murder, and it should be proved that he had murdered; would you contend his conduct was right? would you say the man had done well, and that his act of murder was no objection to his goodness, because he was a *good* man? would not the act prove him not a good man? I submit to your own good sense to determine.

Apply this reasoning. You say God is good. If I prove that he makes his children miserable, or, what is the same thing, gives them a constitution which proves an eternal evil to them, should I not prove your assertion false? If I prove this, should I not prove that God was not good? So far as the principle is concerned the cases are parallel, and I leave you again to decide.

Allow me to enquire, what is goodness? Now we all know very well what the term means, when applied to man. We all know that a good man will not bring evil or misery upon any one if he can avoid it. Yea, he will do more: he will make all happy to the extent of his ability. This is goodness. Apply the term to God. If it mean something else, when applied to him, that something else is not goodness, and should be called by another name.

You and I both used the term, when speaking of God. I believe it a proper term and I use it in its proper sense, the one I have given it. Now is God thus good? You say he is. I bring the evil which now exists among his children as an objection. You deny it as an objection because God is good. You will perceive you take the very point for granted which you ought to prove to wit, the goodness of God.

You may say I admit he is good. So I do, when you admit the evil he tolerates in this system of things, is introduced for an ulterior design, or that it shall terminate in our advantage. You may deny that God is the authour of our misery: so do I, that he is directly the authour. But he has given us a constitution, and this constitution results at present in our sufferings. I contend that this constitution will result in our felicity, else God was not good in giving it. Now as I am assured that God is good, and as I cannot reconcile his goodness on any other hypothesis, I conclude all will

receive happiness enough from this constitution which we have, taking the whole of our existence into consideration, to over balance the evil which it occasions. If you say that evil will eternally continue, I contend you deny the goodness of God.

Having given this statement of the argument, and this general view of the ground I shall take, I wait your reply.

I am, dear sir, respectfully yours, &c.

O. A. BROWNSON.

We have occupied much room in this number with an ungrateful controversy with the editor of the Gospel Herald. But it was necessary. We could not avoid it without injury to ourselves and we believe injustice to our patrons. We do not intend our paper shall be filled with personal controversy. But we should be unworthy the confidence of the publick, if we allowed our rights to be trampled upon, and our characters traduced without even an attempt to defend ourselves. We have however done with this unpleasant affair, and wo do not think T. Fisk, or his associates will be able to call us from the primary design of our work.

Rev. Abner Kneeland is appointed AGENT for the Gospel Advocate in the city of New-York.

We have received no number of the Free Enquirer later than the 22nd. We should like to receive them, for we are somewhat interested in Miss Wright's lectures on knowledge.

We have several communications from correspondents of considerable merit, which we shall publish as we find room.

The Sermon delivered at the funeral of the Rev. C. R. Marsh, by Barzillai Streeter, will be published in our next.

It has been signified to us that we might obtain many new subscribers in New-York and other places, if it were certain the present editor would continue to edit the Advocate during the year. If we live and have our health, we shall continue to devote our labours to the editorial department, long as we believe we can be useful by so doing. Our paper is permanently established, and we trust there will be no more change of editors very soon.

We acknowledge the receipt of a very excellent Sermon, for which the authour, Mr. Thomas Whittemore, of Cambridgeport, Mass. or whoever sent it to us, will accept our thanks. We would give our readers a view of it, but have room to say no more.

We have received the first number of the third volume of the Utica Evangelical Magazine, edited and published by Br. Dolphus Skinner. Its appearance is somewhat improved. Its matter is mostly original and generally interesting. Whatever may have been the state of feeling between this paper and the Gospel Advocate, we wish Br. Skinner abundant success and proffer him, whether he accepts them or not, our congratulations on the success which has hitherto crowned his labours.

Br. Rayner, of the Religious Inquirer, has published four sermons on the 46th verse of the 25th chapter of St. Matthew. They completely refute the common deductions from that passage, and indeed conclusively show that endless misery is not proveable by scripture. We think we shall soon present these sermons to our readers, as the best treat we can give them.

NOTICE. The Southern Association of Universalists is requested to meet at Hartford, Conn. on the THIRD Wednesday and Thursday of May next, instead of the fourth, as before published.—*Rel. Inq.*

MARRIED.—In Zanesville, Ohio, on the 12th ult. by Rev. G. C. Sedwick, Mr. JOSIAH B. ALLEN, to Miss MARTHA FRANCES, daughter of Gen. Samuel Herrick.

DIED—At Weedsport, on the 23d ult. CHARLES HAYDEN, Esq. in the 77th year of his age. Mr. Hayden had long been a believer in the salvation of all men. He tried this faith through a long and painful illness, and found its support when the messenger Death appeared. At his request made just before his death the editor of this paper preached his funeral sermon.

At Cayuga Bridge in Aurelius, on the 26th ult. Mrs. BOSTEDER, wife of Mr. J. D. Bosteder, in the 20th year of her age. Mrs. Bosteder was a believer in God's impartial love. Her sickness was short and extremely painful, but she derived support from the hope that she should triumph over mortality through the grace of our Common Father. We could drop with her husband a tear at her grave, but it was mingled with the joyful hope that all shall finally meet where death is unknown.

In Sempronius, on the 24th ult. HANNAH, consort of Capt. Benjamin Oakley, aged 28 years. Her complaint was the palsy, which suddenly deprived her mourning husband of a kind and affectionate companion. Her numerous circle of relatives and acquaintances will long remember her worth; and the poor will lament the loss of a warm and charitable friend

---

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

STANZAS.

O blest Urania, heavenly muse,
My soul with song inspire,
Thy musick through my heart diffuse
Thy strains of Melody profuse,
Thy pure poetick fire.

Tune every sweet, harmonious string,
Let my frail numbers join,
God's equitable grace to sing;
His love whence purest pleasures spring—
His Majesty divine.

Ye Seraphs swell your notes of praise,
Salvation be your theme;
While earth her grateful homage pays,
Let seas and skies, their voices raise,
And bless the great Supreme.

For him your lyres, ye minstrels sweep,
From whom all things began,
To him protracted vigils keep,
Sing how he reared the mighty deep,
And formed the creature man.

His wisdom shines in every star,
That gilds the azure skies,
His mercy gladdens ev'ry sphere.
And bids created man revere
A God supreme and wise.

J. M. D.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.
DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, MAY 2, 1829. [NO. 9.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

Delivered at the Funeral of the Rev. CHARLES R. MARSH, *who died at Brooklyn, Pa. March* 11, 1828.

BY BARZILLAI STREETER.

"Man goeth to his long home and the mourners go about the streets."—Eccl. xii. 5.

"When a great man dies the world sustains a loss." But it should be remembered, that extensive acquisitions, splendid talents, and brilliancy of genius, do not, alone, constitute true greatness of character. It is he only, who devotes his days, his talents and his strength to the promotion of noble and worthy purposes, that has the highest and strongest claim to the character of a great man: and such, indeed, were the claims of our departed and lamented MARSH.

In him we have seen intellect of the highest order, associated with the most ardent and exalted feelings of piety. Possessed of a strong and discriminating judgement, a vivid and well-regulated fancy, and a taste improved and chastened by the light of science, he was able fully to comprehend, and with much precision and clearness, to develope the "truth of God." The faithfulness with which he discharged his ministerial duties, as a "steward of the manifold grace of God," evinced the fervour of his prayers and the sincerity of his exertions for the spiritual prosperity and happiness of those, "over whom, the Holy Ghost had made him overseer." His Christian spirit and deportment in social life; the deep interest he took in the temporal welfare of his people, and his religious conversation in the chamber of sickness and the house of mourning, have stamped upon his memory the indelible characteristicks of a great and a good man. We say not, that he was perfect—no, he *was human;* but his faults were small and few.

Still, virtues, however clustering, and talents, however brilliant, are no guarantee against the ravages of death! We see the simple and the wise, the young and the old, the peasant and the prince, wither and fall alike before the breath of the "destroying angel." The Sages of antiquity slumber side by side, with the idiots of their nation. And the same power which unstrung such mighty genius, will bring us all down to the same dark dwelling of unconsciousness. Its withering influence is seen and felt, in the motionless remains, that are before us. It is and must be universally true that, "man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets."

But all deaths have not the same effect upon us. In the one we now witness, we realize that a bright star has set forever, and a strong pillar is removed from the Christian Church. The narrow bounds of our existence here, are drawn out before us in dark and striking reality. The shortness of human life comes home to us, on this occasion, with unusual power. Now we see that life in reality is "a tale that is told;" and as the "dream and vision of the night." Our present life compared with an eternity of existence, may well be described by "a shuttle flung from the hand," and as "an arrow shot from the bow." "Clouds scattered by the wind," the "flight of small birds," and the "vapour that vanishes," are also, striking descriptions of the brevity of human life. But when I look, my friends, at these startling descriptions; when I see before me a visible demonstration of them, and reflect that I, that you, that this whole congregation must soon follow and mingle with the dead, I tremble beneath a shivering sense of the fatal insecurity that surrounds us. One cross accident may snap the brittle tenure, and crush the noble fabrick into ruins. But silenced be such forebodings!

Brethren, God reigns; events are ordered in wisdom. To live—to die—what matters it to us, if "God be all in all!" Immortality is disclosed in the Gospel. That moment we begin to die, the bud of being begins to open on a purer world. The body's dissolution is the spirit's birth-day; and the end of temporal existence is the beginning of life eternal. In seasons like the present, the real Christian makes a fairer estimate upon the value of his hope of immortality through the merits of a risen Saviour; and the facts and principles of the Christian Religion become more strongly rivetted in his mind, and entwined around his heart. It is to-day that the great doctrines of the Bible, which your faithful and lamented Pastor has so frequently, so earnestly and so feelingly urged upon you, rush with redoubled charms upon your recollection.

On this trying occasion, it will be my object to apply the balm and cordial to the wounded and depressed in spirit; to comfort those that

mourn; to raise your confidence in your Maker, and your gratitude to Him, for the means of grace and glory with which you have been so signally favoured. And I know of no way more favourable to my design, than to lay before you a brief sketch of those sublime truths, which the deceased believed and taught, and by which he lived and died. To do this we must examine the foundation which he laid for his hope, and the doctrinal superstructure which he reared upon it. And,

1. The foundation of all religion, whether Christian, Pagan, Mahometan or Jew, is a belief in the existence of "One God,"* and the infinite perfection of all his attributes.

This foundation, and the reasons and evidences for it, the deceased has often shown you with the clearness of demonstration, by a recurrence to the worlds which God hath made, and the words of truth which he hath spoken.

It is, therefore, necessary for me to notice only the conclusions which he has drawn from this fact, which are not less dear, conclusive and convincing than the evidence of the fact itself. Let us look then at his premises, and the deductions drawn from them.

1. God is infinite in goodness. This position is universally acknowledged; and hence it is inferred, that no system of moral government could emanate from God, that should not ultimate in the greatest good and highest glory of his creatures. A disposition to create beings with a predetermination to sink them into endless perdition, or with a previous knowledge that this would be their final destiny, cannot be reconciled with the spirit of Infinite Benevolence. Otherwise, infinite misery is a good, end, if so, why dread, why shun it? why not eagerly pursue and lay hold upon it? why not "flee from earth and fly to hell?" If endless misery be good for ONE it is good for ALL; or if it be not good for all collectively, it cannot be good for any one individually. If then, the endless misery of one and of all who should endure it, be an evil, as all must admit, then it cannot be the work of Infinite Goodness to inflict it. For, from goodness, nothing but goodness can flow; and by it, nothing can be designed and nothing done, but what shall result in good. An eternity of suffering, therefore, is an eternity of evil; and hence can make no part of the plan of the Deity, either by design or by permission. A Being of Infinite Benevolence can no more permit endless suffering, than design it; for what his goodness would not allow him to *design*, it would not allow him to *permit*, seeing he is able also to prevent it.

2. God is Just. But justice cannot demand what goodness forbids; for then the harmony of the divine attributes would be deranged, and the foundation of all religion would be destroyed. Justice may indeed, and does, require the judicious correction of all who shall offend; but it cannot require the endless suffering of any, because justice itself is goodness, and goodness forbids it. Goodness demands a reasonable and salutary chastisement, and justice can demand no more. In this, then, their harmony is seen, that both are in fact the same and act in reference to one result—the good of the punished.

In the administration of human laws, condign punishment is advocated I know, on the ground that the example acts as a restraint upon others; not that it is founded on rules of strict justice, but on principles of expediency. But even this cannot hold good in relation to a future state. For this would be, to suppose the torments of hell *necessary* to act as a restraint upon the saints in heaven! Neither can such misery redound to the glory of God, seeing it is admitted on all hands, that "the glory of God and the happiness of his creatures are inseparably connected." And nothing can be plainer than this, that God cannot be glorified and honoured by an act, which benefits not him, but entails an eternal curse and injury upon his own offspring. Neither can this load of wretchedness augment the felicity of saints in glory; because "there is more joy in heaven over *one* sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance." Were it true that the miseries of the damned increase the happiness of the saints, then the text would be falsified; for the "joy in heaven" would be enhanced, not by the repentance of sinners, but by their final impenitence! But if there be one here, who anticipates additional happiness in heaven, by witnessing the horrid shrieks and languishing exclamations of damned spirits, allow me to say to you, my brother, whoever thou art, "ye must be born again!" Did you know "what manner of spirit ye are of?" you would contemplate an eternity of pleasure, springing forth, from the consciousness of being yourself saved, and the humble hope of the final recovery of all others, who like yourself are "sinners before God."

You would see the salvation of all sinners equally as consistent with the justice of your Maker, and the best good of the Universe, as your own salvation; and you would say in truth that, God is not a Being that can save and will not, or that would save and cannot; but you would say with the Apostle, "We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men.

My brethren, were the instructions of Nature and Providence reversed; did the sun shine only to dazzle and confound the sight; were the fountains of water pregnant with the bane of death; were every plant a poison, and every shower a pestilence, then we might indeed infer that the Creator gloried in the tor-

*The Pagans do not, we believe, generally admit the unity of God.—ED.

ments of his creatures. But not so now, since the earth is loaded with his goodness, and the heavens drop down fatness. In these visible evidences of his regard for our temporal enjoyment, and the great plan of redemption to secure our eternal glory, we witness the harmony of all his attributes, and the efficient operation of them to establish the empire of peace and the happiness of man.

God is not simple, that he cannot design; nor weak, that he cannot execute, what pure and unmixed benevolence inspires. Governed by no motives but such as Infinite Goodness dictates, his wisdom cannot devise, nor his power effect ought, but what his goodness approves. This, my brethren, is an imperfect sketch of the general views which your deceased pastor entertained of the character of his Maker, and which he so faithfully advocated among you. And it is my prayer, that you may never loose sight of these "ancient land marks of faith, which enable you to trust alone in God, and to speak well of his name.

II. The authenticity of the holy scriptures, and the divine authority and mission of Christ, were not only cordially believed, but lucidly exemplified in all his publick preaching and private life. He preached as he believed, and practiced as he preached. He had a mind which could grasp and comprehend the great truths of the Gospel, and a happy talent to simplify them to the capacity of all who heard him. His language was energetick and chaste, and his manner mild and modest, impressive and sincere. Blending in a useful manner, persuasion with argument, and the descriptive with the sublime, few indeed, if any of his age, could surpass him, in presenting to the understanding, in a clear and striking light, the native purity and original attractions of the Christian religion.

The Bible being his guide in all matters of faith and practice, he believed in common with Christians of every name (whatever may be the peculiarities of their speculations on other points) in the indispensible necessity of "repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." For however exhilirating the doctrine of the gospel may be, in itself considered, yet all will admit, that it must be believed, before it can be enjoyed; and this belief must sink deeper than a mere speculative principle, which only plays around the head, but enters not the heart. A preparation of the heart by evangelical faith and repentance, is doubtless an essential qualification for the true enjoyment of everlasting life.

But our departed brother also believed that if God appoints or wills an event, he appoints also efficient means to effect it. Hence, if he design or will that all men shall ultimately repent and believe the gospel to the salvation of their souls, he also designs or wills the means to effect this divine purpose. And as no rational man believes until his judgement is convinced, so no man repents till motives are laid before him which mellow and change his heart. Hence, we believe, that whatever has a tendency to create alarm or to awake disgust, is also calculated to exasperate and harden the feelings, rather than to soften and win the affections; and that course of preaching, which exhibits the mercy and goodness of God, in all their mild and winning charms, is more likely to produce "Godly repentance," than the thunders of Sinai, or the repulsive descriptions of an incensed Omnipotence.—For "the goodness (not the wrath) of God, leadeth to repentance."

Let those who wink at folly and slumber over their depravity and crimes, be awakened to a sense of God's goodness as shown forth in Providence, and above all, as exhibited in the redemption of the world, and the foundation of faith is laid, and the seeds of repentance are planted. Let them follow "the Son of God," from the manger-cradle to the cross, from the cross to the tomb, and from the tomb, in his ascension to glory, "to his God and to our God, to his Father and to our Father," and the delusions of scepticism will give place to the precepts and principles of Jesus.

So believed our departed brother, and so we believe. Does any one here, ask "the reason of our hope" in the final repentance of every man? We answer—because "the goodness of God leadeth to repentance;" and "he is good to ALL, and his tender mercies are over all his works." Because, "he hath granted forgiveness of sins unto Israel, and to the Gentiles, repentance unto life." We believe it, because without repentance, no sinner can be saved, and yet "God is the Saviour of all men." Because, "every knee shall bow and every tongue confess, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." For these and many other reasons, founded upon the word of God, we believe that evangelical faith and godly repentance will be experimentally felt and enjoyed by the whole human race.

III. In common with the Christian world, our lamented friend believed and defended the necessity of the new birth and of personal holiness of life. But grounding his faith upon the holy scriptures, he did not believe the new birth to be effected by "the will of the flesh, nor by the will of man, but by the will of God." "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." He believed that in many instances, the expressions, "born again," &c. denoted no more than a radical change of faith; a renunciation of the errours of Judaism, on the one hand, and the Heathen idolatries on the other, and an adoption of the gospel of truth. In those

cases in which the new birth involves a change in moral and religious feeling, he believed it was the work of him to effect it, "who turneth the hearts of the children of men, even as the river of waters are turned." And resting all his hopes upon the will of a benevolent God, he patiently waited for the period of their consummation.

Personal holiness of life was not only the natural tendency of his doctrines, but composed the even tenure of his life, and the burden of his publick labours. But he claimed not heaven as the reward of his obedience. He hoped for it as the unmerited gift of God, and urged the utility of practical godliness, as "good and profitable unto men." If any one thing is taught in the bible with more precision and certainty than another, it is this, that eternal life is the free gift of God to the world. For "the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." That "as by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men unto condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." For, "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound, that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Upon these inspired assurances, he expected salvation, not on the ground of purchase or reward, but as the free gift of God. And he made this doctrine the ground for, and the stimulus to a godly life. For "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world."

With others of the Christian faith, your deceased pastor believed and taught the accountability of man to God, and in rewards and punishments according to our works. But in distinction from many, he did not believe that the word of Jehovah taught, or that his justice required an infinite recompence for a finite action. That all moral actions are finite in their nature, and that the reward of them is limited in duration and degree, is the dictate of reason and the sentiment of inspiration.

It is the dictate of reason, because the magnitude of human actions must be measured by the human understanding; and, therefore, to contend that our offences are infinitely sinful, would be contending for the infinity of our knowledge. Moreover, it is certain that all sins are not equally heinous; for if all sins were infinite, then would all degrees of comparison be lost, and instead of there being *great*, *greater* and *greatest* sins, all would be alike infinite. But sin consists in the vicious motive of the sinner; and as no finite being can form an infinite motive, so no finite man can perform an infinite act, either virtuous or vicious; nor is there any law or justice which demands an infinite punishment for a finite offence. The degree of punishment must be proportioned to the nature of the crime, and as all crimes are limited in their nature, so all punishment is limited in duration and degree.

It is also the sentiment of inspiration, that punishment is adapted to the nature of the offence, and that the degree of a man's accountability, is in proportion to the degree of his knowledge. For "unto whom little is given, little is required, and unto whom much is given, of him will I require the more." For "he that knoweth his Master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes; where as he which knoweth not his Master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with few. In this language of the Saviour, we see that a man's knowledge fixes the character of his disobedience, and that the number of stripes are varied to the nature and limitation of the offence. Offences, then, are finite, and punishment temporary; and it is as reasonable to believe that a man merits eternal glory by his virtues, as that he deserves eternal suffering for his sins.

But it was also believed and advocated, by the deceased, that punishment is parental and disciplinary; and as such is inflicted in mercy for the good of those who suffer. For "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," and although "no chastisement seemeth to be joyous for the present, but grievous, nevertheless, afterwards it yieldeth peaceable fruits of righteousness to all who are exercised thereby." God, then, does not afflict any because he hates them, nor to gratify vindictive and malignant passions; but because he loves us as sons, and corrects, that "we may be made partakers of his holiness." No, "the Lord will not cast off forever, for though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his tender mercies."

Chastisement, or punishment, is, therefore, not opposed to grace and mercy, but is a means that grace employs to effect a gracious end; viz. to subdue the rebellious.

In this view of the subject, the justice and mercy of God, which, by the hasty speculations and unsound theories of men, are too often arrayed against each other, are harmonized. He is not represented, as being *unmercifully* just on the one hand, nor *unjustly* merciful on the other; and by thus shuning this absurd paradox, we behold the mutual co-operation of both mercy and justice in promoting the holiness and happiness of man.

V. In agreement with many, he believed in, and taught the universality of the atonement. That Christ "is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." For by "the grace of God, he hath tasted death for every man." And hence we are constrained to judge, "that

if one hath died for all, then were all dead; and that he hath died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." In these scriptures, the universality of the atonement is clearly expressed; and indeed this doctrine stands foremost on every page, and holds a conspicuous rank in the doctrinal essays of the New-Testament. We shall, therefore, add no more in proof of it, but to say, that "if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life."

But in contradistinction from our Arminian friends, the deceased did not believe the atonement was made, in satisfaction for original imputed sin; and this, because he believed that no such sin existed. Reason does not teach that one man is criminally accountable, for what another has done. A belief that the whole posterity of Adam, was involved in guilt and condemnation for his sin, is both inconsistent with sound reason, and forbidden by the holy scriptures. "Ye shall not any more use this proverb in Israel," saith the Lord, that "the parents have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge;" and why? "For the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father; neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son." We perceive, therefore, that the doctrine of original sin, or the imputation of Adam's transgression to all his posterity, and also the necessity of an atonement to deliver mankind from its curse, is all founded upon an old Jewish proverb, which is forbidden to be used, by one "who spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost." He believed, therefore, that the atonement was made for the actual sins of the world; because there is no other to render an atonement necessary; and also, that it will prove efficacious and available; for otherwise, it might as well never have been made at all. When the Deity projected the system of atonement for all men, he either designed that they should all be benefited by it or he did not. If not, then where was the use in making it? or if he did, then why should we deny the universality of its benefits? The atonement is wholly the work of God, and, therefore, hangs upon no contingency; but is as sure in its operations, as his own immutable purposes.

Its saving and healing influence will be exerted, until all are reconciled to God and each other; till there shall "no more be Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Sythian, bond or free, but all one in Christ;" till "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain," but "every creature which is in heaven, on earth, under the earth, and such as are in the sea, shall be heard, saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto him, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.

VI. And lastly. The doctrine of life and immortality is held in common by all denominations of Christians; but it possesses value and charms only as it was believed and advocated by our departed friend, who has gone to realize the blessedness he anticipated in this glorious change. Endless life is desirable only in proportion to the benefit or happiness it secures to us. Were it as wretched as perpetual, we should shrink from it with horrour, and rather than brook its terrours, rush into the starless night of oblivion. Did we believe such a state of being possible, who would not rather rest forever in the dreamless, unconscious grave, than even hope for heaven at such infinite hazard? It would, indeed, be an object of rational dread, and we should approach it with dismay and terrour. We hope most cordially to exist hereafter; but not to run the hazard of existing in all "consuming, but never devouring flames," but to secure to ourselves an eternity of glory. It is only when we can contemplate the article of death as our passport to immortality, and immortality as a shelter from the moral tempests by which we are at present buffeted, that we can stand with firmness over the dying pillow, and yield up with resignation the tenderest object of our love. Encouraged by this hope, with what cheerfulness the spirit quits its hold on time, and fastens of the arm extended over the altar of succouring mercy. It relies not upon the bare wish of the unhappy, but leans upon the promise of hope fast anchored in eternity. He feels the freezing approach of dissolution, and the lamp of life falling into darker shades, but is cheered by the star of immortality that hovers over his spirit to conduct it home. Filled with this hope, he welcomes the messenger that shall strike the staggering blow, and meets his change in triumph.

This was that hope which sustained and animated the spirit of him, whose cold and motionless remains lie there before you. In the twilight of his existence, when the grave was opening to receive his body, and heaven to welcome his spirit, immortality opened and brightened around him, and without doubt or struggle he launched into the ocean of eternal joys. Say not, then, that this doctrine will do to live, but not to die by. What else can administer rational consolation to the departing spirit in the evening of our days? To talk of the comforts of belief in unending torments, is the climax of absurdity. Ask the dying if he can smile at another's woe, and his every look will answer,

"I cannot go
"Where universal love smiles not around;
"Sustaining all yon orbs and all their suns;
"From seeming evil, still evincing good,
"And better thence again, and better still
"Infinite in progression."

No, my Christian friends, we cannot hope for heaven, at the expense of others' wretchedness; God never gave us nerves to exult over human misery, nor strung our tender sympathies to be wrung with everlasting anguish. No—God has created us for nobler purposes, and a higher distinction. And may God grant that we may stagger not at his promises thro' disbelief, but remain steadfast in the hope of the gospel, till we are translated from a world of trials and tears to the ineffable glories of his heavenly kingdom.

The Addresses are omitted for want of room.—Ed.

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIANITY.

NO. IX.

THE TRINITY RESUMED.

Having disposed of our preliminary questions, we are now prepared to resume our discussion of the trinity. My readers will understand me. I am not now inquiring whether Christ be the eternal God, or whether he be a super-angelick, a super-human or simply a human being. Each of these questions will receive a due share of attention, as our essay proceeds. I am now considering the position, that God exists in three distinct persons, the same in substance, and equal in power and glory.

By turning to No. 2 of this essay, the reader will perceive it was there shown, this doctrine is not only not taught by reason, but that it is opposed to our natural apprehension of things, very nearly if not quite, involving an absolute contradiction. I have, I think, in my remarks on the use of reason, clearly shown, that the bible cannot authorize us to believe, or require us to contend for a doctrine which is unreasonable. I might therefore conclude the discussion of the trinity, by saying, it is unreasonable, and there is no authority which can establish an unreasonable doctrine. But I shall not avail myself of this argument. The trinity is said to be a bible doctrine, and it is therefore proper to examine how far this assertion be correct.

Some trinitarians, more zealous than wise, attempt to prove their doctrine from the Jewish scriptures. The Jews, who may be supposed to understand their own scriptures as well as Christians, strenuously deny that any such sentiment is taught in their books, and urge the fact, as one of their chief objections against the truth of Christianity. This consideration alone is sufficient to convince any sound discriminating mind, that the sentiment is not found in the sacred books of the Jews.

The Jews, who had the prophets and the traditions of their elders, never dreamed the promised Messiah was the second person in the Godhead. They considered him a temporal prince. They looked forward to his advent, as the approach of an eminent man, who was to exalt their nation, and magnify the throne of David. An impartial view of the prophets will warrant this conclusion. No person, but a slave to prejudice, can discover a single prediction in the old Testament, which bears the least allusion to the fact for which trinitarians contend, that the Messiah was one of the ineffable trinity.

This, though of itself conclusive, may not satisfy those who see chariots in the fire, and horsemen fighting in the clouds. One or two criticims shall be noticed. In Genesis it is said, in our translation, "In the beginning God created &c." But in the original, the word rendered God, is in the plural number. Now say these critics, the Hebrew language has three numbers. The singular which expresses but one object, the dual which expresses two, and the plural which expresses more than two. As the word rendered God, is in the plural, and not in the dual, they say it cannot express less than three. This indeed would prove as many as three Gods, to say the least, were it not also a fact, that the word rendered *created* is in the singular. Then as they render the word "In the beginning Gods, not less than three and but one created &c." I mention this, that my readers may see what kind of evidence is brought to prove a doctrine which nobody can understand. Admitting all this, it does not prove the trinity. The most that can be said, is, that it proves a plurality in unity. But it does not prove this. The Hebrews often join a noun with a plural termination, to a singular verb, to express dignity. The plural number answering the purpose of an adjective to that effect. Hence too, for the same purpose they say, "Jehovah Elohim" Lord Gods, or the highest God.

The authority of this part of the book of Genesis, is very precarious. It bears the marks of a philosophy, superannuated by the discoveries of modern science, and must be ranked with the numerous fictions of the East, invented to account for the origin of the world, and the introduction of evil. But let this pass. A Jew would smile at such criticisms upon his language, and the discerning will not fail to conclude the cause which needs them, is, at best, a weak one.

There is one passage more I notice, Deut. vi 4. "The Lord our *God* is one Lord." The word rendered *God* in this verse, is said to be, in the plural number, and as it is used in connection with the term *one*, it is supposed to teach the idea of plurality in unity. But as this does not prove the trinity, I might dismiss it, were there not a strong argument to prove the trinitarian criticism is incorrect. Jesus Christ was doubtless, as good a biblical critick as modern divines, and the apostles themselves I think, were not much behind. Christ quotes this verse, Mark xii. 29; but translates this supposed plural Hebrew noun, by a Greek one

in the singular. Now it is somewhat unaccountable, that Christ should have failed to notice this plurality in unity, had it existed; and he or the apostles must be considered very remiss in their duty, not to have used in their translation, a plural noun; and even our translators, strenuous trinitarians, failed in their duty, for had it been in the plural, they should have written Gods, instead of God.

My reader will perceive, admitting all for which the trinitarians contend from these passages, they only prove a plurality in the Godhead. This would sound strange to a Jew who every body knows, has always strenuously asserted the strict unity of the Deity. But, to prove this plurality is exactly, the number three, neither more nor less, the sharp-sighted trinitarian critick reads somewhere in the old Testament, no matter where, that same one, addressing the Deity, said, "Holy, holy, holy Lord God;" repeating the term "three times," it is evident the speaker recognized three persons in the Godhead. For, if he did not, why did he repeat the term holy, just three times, neither less nor more? This argument may speak for itself.

I have now presented all which I am aware that trinitarians ever urge from the old Testament, in favour of the three-fold God. What it proves I know not, except the paucity of materials, which the advocate of this notion, has with which to construct his mighty fabrick. I have already stated, the old Testament cannot, with consistency, be alledged as proof of a christian doctrine. I repeat the sentiment, that I may not be misunderstood. This part of the bible, may teach us Judaism; but Christians are not Jews. The two dispensations have no other connection with each other, than that both were given to the same people, and that the first teachers of christianity were, not only Jews themselves, but they preached to Jews, and appealed to authority which the Jews acknowledged, to convince them, Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah.

Had this distinction, which evidently exists between the two, been always observed, the religious world would have avoided many of the errours into which they have fallen. The old dispensation was given to the Jews. It served indeed, as a school master to prepare them for the Christian, but it was to vanish, on the introduction of that more perfect system. Christianity came with the blaze of the noonday sun, whereas Judaism shone only as the twinkling of a star. Shall we reject the sun, the glory of the Luminary of heaven, for the feeble glimmering of a midnight star? Surely not. The new alludes to the old—so far as necessary, to explain these allusions the old is valuable, any farther it is as a statute repealed. I therefore dismiss the arguments, drawn from the old Testament to establish the trinity, and shall consider, in my next number, those which are drawn from the new.

AN ESSAY ON DIVINE GOODNESS.

NO. IV.

A fourth answer to the question, why do men act wrong, attributes it to our ignorance. This answer is one which I have repeatedly urged. But it must be understood with many qualifications, or it will mislead.

Love of theory is the greatest enemy to the discovery of truth. Men seem anxious to reduce all things, to a few first principles, that the cause of every thing may be given in a word. This were well, if they knew every thing. We know but little, and much we do know depends for its existence, on that which we do not, which we cannot know. Thousands of events, are daily and even hourly occurring, which we are unable to trace to any antecedent or cause. The world is a system of perpetual change; and, though we admit general laws, by which the whole is governed, the number of particulars, which occur as exceptions, are often more numerous, than those which follow the general rule. It is therefore, in vain to expect, any one thing can be the cause of that which every thing conspires to produce.

Still we may, from what we know, form some rational conclusions respecting this so much agitated question. I may repeat here, the substance of what I have said in many other places. But it is necessary to a regular discussion, if indeed my rambling sentences can claim that appellation. This, however, is nothing more than what others do. If we told nothing but what we knew, and told that but once, we should soon be condemned to uninterrupted silence.

If we may be allowed to figure to our minds the commencement of this world, we may readily suppose, that it could be, in the first stage of its existence, nothing more, than an infant just drawing its breath. It would be idle, at least reasoning from analogy, to suppose the infant was wiser or more knowing than the adult. Setting aside the fictions of poets, and the dreams of those who are dissatisfied with the present, about the golden days of antiquity, when all was peace and holiness, we may pronounce man, when first permitted to breathe upon this "terrestrial ball," an infant, and like all infants destitute of knowledge. The tree of knowedge indeed, grew within his reach; but as yet its fruit was untouched. The tree of life grew there too, but it was unheeded. All the energies of intellect were unawakened, all that mental and moral vigour, which were to exert that mighty influence on the affairs of the world, which we see it has, then slumbered in embryo. The seeds of all the passions which were to germinate, spring up and produce the mighty harvest of every species of fruit, were indeed, planted in the infantile mind; but, as yet were uninfluenced by the vegitating power. Such was man.

His first sensation was want. He was uneasy; he sought to remove his uneasiness. Ignorant, not knowing aliment from poison, unacquainted with the constitution of things, unable to predict the consequences of his actions, he acted simply from impulse, unguided by the least ray of light he was equally liable to act wrong as right. He was like the babe, put every thing into his mouth, which came in the way of his hands. If he swallowed a poison he knew no antidote, but was as likely to swallow another. He took a wrong step, he was lost in the wilderness, saw no mark that was familiar, none which could direct to the spot he wished to reach. To rest inactive, he could not, to proceed he must, but ignorant of the way, he would as soon pursue the wrong as the right path. He proceeded, but instead of following a strait forward path, which would have conducted him to a habitable spot, he traversed the wilds in circles, and though wearied with endless exertion, he found himself either returning to the same spot, or wandering still farther into the immeasurable gloom. Such was undoubtedly the original condition of man, and such the immediate cause of his first errours, and the commission of those acts which involved him in wretchedness.

Admitting what I have here alledged, we may assume the reason why we go wrong, is because we are ignorant. But there is a fact which stares this theory in the face, and which may appear to some, an insurmountable objection. The fact is, mankind do not, at least when viewed as individuals, do not do, as well as they know. It is not seldom we see a man doing that which he is sensible, in every moment of reflection, is opposed to his best good. How can this fact be reconciled to the position that ignorance is the cause of our acting wrong? The solution is easy. Man is a creature of habit. When men are accustomed to any practice, they acquire a habit which makes it often extremely difficult to avoid it. This principle is one which should not be overlooked. Man through ignorance went wrong, habit confirmed him in a course of aberration. He also goes wrong, through the influence of others, when his own judgement if followed, would direct right. We act upon each other. Commencing wrong we established wrong principles, gave wrong impressions to each other's mind, a wrong bias to the minds of children; erected society upon a wrong basis, hence through the influence of these considerations, we often continue to go wrong when we know better. Ignorance, however, is the efficient, though habit and the influence of improperly organized society, is the immediate cause.

We have found the cause of moral evil—it is traced to the misconduct of moral beings. We have found the cause of the misconduct of moral beings—it is ignorance, the imperfect constitution of our nature, or rather to the want of experience, or necessary knowledge when we first began to act. But we have removed no difficulty though we may have prepared the way. Why did a God infinitely good and wise, place us here with so little knowledge, liable to all the pains and calamities which proceed from our ignorance? This is the question, and it is the same as to ask, why did God make us as he has? Now I have no right to ask this question, and certainly shall not attempt to answer it. We may discover from what has been offered, that man is made subject to vanity, is placed here ignorant, and compelled to learn his duty and his felicity in the severe school of experience. Whether God could have made him a different being or not, is no concern of mine, since man is made as he is. The only proper enquiry is, has Deity so constructed him, that he is capable by the means put into his hands, to obtain more good than evil, more happiness than misery? If we can answer this question in the affirmation, we may pronounce our Creator good. If we must reply in the negative, Deity so far as our knowledge extends, must be called evil.

Are we susceptible of happiness? Are we able to procure happiness enough to overbalance the evil we suffer? To the first we say yes; to the second I will not reply until further enquiry. We must take the world as it is, for all seems of a piece—and if we make an alteration in one part, without a corresponding one in every other, we disconcert the whole. We suppose, for indeed much of our reasoning on this subject must be hypothetical, that man is fitted to his condition, that Deity in making him, gave him those powers and faculties, susceptibilities &c. which should fit him for that particular station he was designed to occupy. Man seems a progressive being, whether viewed in reference to the individual, or to the species. Admitting this, we can devise no better plan on which he could have been created; we can propose no alteration in his constituent principles, without making him worse.

The question, why did Deity permit evil to enter his system, is an improper one. We see evil flows, as a necessary consequence from the present organization of things. The question why Deity organized nature as he has, is improper. We are only to ask, is there more good than evil to be derived from it? This is the question, and my next will attempt to answer it. Our love to God will never be strong nor permanent, until we are fully convinced he is good; and our love to mankind will not be as it should, until we have the most ardent love for the Creator.

THE TIMES.

NO. II.

In writing the Essays under this head, I wish to forget the clerical character, as well as that I am the partizan of a sect. My object is

to point out some errours, which have been tolerated, and to develope the best means of procuring the welfare of the human race, while inhabitants of the earth.

Though I disclaim as unworthy of him who is ambitious to obtain just sentiments and just feelings, all national partialities or antipathies, I still feel my bosom glow with warm emotion, when the name of this country is mentioned. Not because it is *my* country, but because its government, I believe, is the best, human wisdom has ever been able to devise, and because I think the philanthropist may labour here with the best prospect of meliorating the condition of the human family.

The benevolent mind turns with joy from the despotick governments which have prevailed, and which now prevail over the greater part of the world—the benevolent mind, sickened with these, may turn with joy to our more favoured land, illumined by the morning sun of Liberty. Here one may say the human race has survived its downward progress, and has begun to rise in the scale of knowledge and independence. We gained a victory, not for ourselves, but for the world; we triumphed over arbitrary power, and the trophies of that triumph may yet be erected in every clime and by every people.

We have declared ourselves free. We are now teaching the world man is capable of self government. We are a school in which nations are to learn the rights of man, and be taught the road to the acme of human greatness and felicity. Our Republick stands like the beacon, upon some lofty eminence, to light the care-worn and depressed sons of despotick climes, to home and to happiness. If we are wise, if we do not allow our light to become darkness, posterity shall bless our memories, as benefactors of the human race, as the regenerators of the world.

Though our institutions may not yet bear the stamp of perfection, though men may be susceptible of greater liberty than our government allows, every philanthropist, no matter where he resides, should lend all his support to our institutions, that we may never retrogade but keep onward in the march of improvement. If we fail, human happiness may slumber for a hundred centuries; if we succeed, the splendour of our example may enlighten the world. What then is our duty! how careful should we be in every step we take, in every measure we adopt!

I have said that the basis of our government is intelligence. Ignorance may sap the foundation of our liberty. But knowledge, salutary in its influence, will give permanence to our institutions, and send the blessing of freedom, civil and mental, to the latest posterity. The patriot then will labour to enlighten his countrymen, and the friend to man will do all in his power to render knowledge universal. I have said our government declares all men equal, and proceeds upon the maxim, that one man weighs as much as another. The destruction of this equality may prove dangerous. When one outweighs another, he may obtain more than his share, and perhaps obtain the adoption of measures unequal in their bearing. Hence our caution is required to prevent the equality, which our government recognizes, from being destroyed.

It requires no stretch of thought to perceive that knowledge is power, that in our government the man who is well informed can rule the ignorant, and even deprive him in many instances, of the exercise of his rights. What shall be done? shall we deprecate knowledge, and labour to bring all *down* to the same standard? No. We should level *upward*—bring the ignorant to the standard of the wise, and aim to elevate those who are now the lowest in the scale of intellectual acquisition, to those who are the highest.

Our resort is to education. But education may be wrong as well as right. And though education undoubtedly is, in this country, nearer what it should be than in any other, yet even here, with a few exceptions, it is almost any thing but what it ought to be. We have schools—no one can find the least fault with the number. We expend money, enough and more than enough, yet, the education we get, is worth but little—little, I mean, compared with what it might be.

Our common schools, incomparably better than our high schools or colleges, amount to but little. What do they teach? The scholar to think? do they point out to him the nature or reason of things? No. They put into his hand a book he does not understand, and compel him through fear or flattery, to wade through it and commit it perhaps, without exercising a single faculty of the mind, except the memory; and after wasting eight or ten years of his time, they send him into the world, learned indeed, but nearly as ignorant of every thing, as he commenced, with the exception of a few words and sentences, he may have committed to memory, without once thinking of their import.

A child thus *educated*, may make no little show among those who have been deprived of any education, but is entirely ignorant of business, or destitue of all knowledge which is applicable to the purposes of life. And what is worse, the habits thus acquired, prevent the the child from obtaining knowledge, when he has left the authority of the pedagogue. The object of all education is, or should be, the acquisition of useful knowledge. Acquaintance with words is useful only as it introduces us to the *things* signified by them.

One learns to read, that he may receive the pleasure of becoming acquainted with the ideas of authors, and derive profit from the knowledge they may afford him. But one may as well be

ignorant of letters, as to read an author without understanding what he writes. One studies grammar, that he may know how to speak and write his language correctly. But if one wastes three or four years, in committing to memory the dreams and arbitrary distinctions of grammarians, without becoming acquainted with the principles of language, or knowing how to apply what he has learned, he has spent his time in vain. The same of every other branch. Nothing should be learned for itself but as it can be made subservient to the important purposes of our existence.

Our common school teachers are not to blame, because they do not teach their pupils to think, for few of them, know how to think themselves. The people are not to blame for procuring such teachers, for they can procure but few others, and a small part only know that such teachers are not as good as any. I blame no body. I only advert to an evil which, if we wish our children to become acquainted with things, we must set our wits at work to remove. Before I get through I shall suggest some hints to effect an object so desirable.

In looking at our common schools, one cannot fail to observe the great waste of time, compared with the little, that is good for any thing which the child acquires. Most of the children, in this state for instance, are at school the greater part of their time, from the age of five to fifteen. Ten years—time enough to give any one education sufficient to qualify him for any station, he may be required to fill, in our country. And yet, more than one half are unable, at the expiration of the time, to understand the force of a simple argument, or to judge with the least accuracy, upon any subject which requires the exercise of thought.

It is apparent, that a material defect in our schools, is, that the teachers do not develope the intellectual powers of the pupil, do not discipline the mind, nor prepare it for relishing the beauty of knowledge. We are told such a child "won't learn," that the teacher cannot induce him "to get his lesson!" Now this is nonsense. Every child loves to learn. Any one may mark the animation of a child, when he obtains a new idea. But the subject requires another No. I must therefore request my readers to wait for it.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

A QUESTION PROPOSED.

In the Trumpet and Universalist Magazine for April the 11th, I notice the following question: "A and B are conversing together. A kills B on the spot, and then puts an end to his own existence immediately. Where will A be punished for his deeds?"

Having always set a high value upon the writings of the editor of that paper, and knowing him to be a man of critical sagacity, as well as of much theological erudition, I seized his reply to this important question, one which had often puzzled myself, with no ordinary avidity. But I must say with all deference to the superiour talents and acquisitions of Mr. Whittemore, that his answer is to me unsatisfactory. I take the liberty to answer the question myself, and will thank Mr. Whittemore to point out whatever may be illogical or incorrect in my answer. I do this the more readily, because I discover most universalist writers are confused in their views of the subject involved in this question; and it is highly important that it be more fully discussed. To its discussion I would request the attention of our editors, at least to correct me if I go wrong.

In answer to the question "Where would A. receive his punishment?" It must, I think, be admitted by every reasonable man, that it cannot be in this world Or, at least, we can alter the case, so that A should die while killing B; then certainly, every one must say, A could not be punished until after death. I shall not be misunderstood. I do not believe man will be punished after death. For, I believe all punishment to be unjust, though I know no reason why man may not be punished, as well after as before death.

Now I do not believe A is punished any where. My readers need not start. Punishment in all cases is unjust and cannot be admitted into the government of God, without destroying his righteous character.—What is punishment? Punishment may be defined:—any infliction with vengeance on account of a crime committed. I very well know Universalists deny that punishment is vindictive, but know also that they admit it is: Else why do they say that every man shall be punished *according* to his deeds? what do they mean when they say no one shall escape *deserved* punishment? Now these expressions must mean something or nothing: If they mean nothing, why use them? If they mean something, what is that something, unless it be that every man who does wrong deserves a certain degree of suffering which he shall by no means escape.

The difficulty seems to be this; Universalists give to the word punishment a meaning different from the one it commonly receives, yet allow themselves to be affected by some illusion of its more ordinary import. Now I have no doubt that Mr. Whittemore understands by the word *punishment*, pain or suffering inflicted upon a person for his benefit or in other words to make him a better man. Now this is not the ordinary import of the term. For if it were who would think of measuring the quantity of pain to be inflicted by the quantity of wrong committed? If pain be inflicted for one's reformation, we are not to enquire what he has done, but how much pain will it require to make this one a good man? If for one's benefit, it is no matter whether the person be innocent or guilty, we are only to enquire how much pain will be beneficial? To talk of desert under this view of punishment, is to talk without understanding oneself.

The one who proposed the question to the editor of the Trumpet and Magazine, did not understand the term in this sense, mankind generally do not. The terms of the question presuppose there is a penalty attached to the commission of evil deeds. Mr. Whitte-

more assumes or concedes this, and then undertakes to prove that the state of mind which led to its commission was its punishment. Now common sense says all punishment, must be posterior to the transgression, for which one is punished. Mr. W.'s Creed would not allow this in the instance before him, he therefore labors to prove the pain of mind before, and during the act was its punishment. If the punishment was vindictive, it could not be thus received, for it is idle to talk of vindicating a wrong, or punishing a crime by anticipation. If the punishment were reformatory, it was not sufficient for it did not prevent the act or in other words it did not cure the depravity of mind so that A should not kill B.

I believe it is a sentiment with Mr. W. and those of his class, that the quantity of punishment required is just the quantity necessary to reform the offender.—Now as A had the depraved state of mind before he killed B, to have been duly punished before he must have been reformed before the act was done. Consequently he would not have murdered, and would have been punished for that which he had never done.

What Mr. W. adduces in proof of his answer is correct, and would be a correct reply, if it were brought to bear upon the point it should. The proposer of the question understood the term punishment in one sense, Mr. Whittemore in another, though he reasons upon it as though both understood it in the same sense. If we understand punishment in its ordinary acceptation we must admit A will be punished for killing B in another world or not be punished at all. If we understand it in the sense of the editor, we mean some thing entirely different and it would save confusion to use another term.

Let us look at the question so far as facts have illuminated it. A depraved mind is always a source of misery—vicious actions always bring misery. Hence Mr. W. would say sin punishes itself. But this is not correct. The mind would not be depraved if it did not bring misery, nor would an action be wrong if it were attended with no painful emotions. To say sin involves its punishment is to speak inaccurately, without understanding what sin is. A kills B. This is wrong because, the act brings misery. Now to kill A is to double the quantity of misery without benefitting B in the least. This therefore would be a useless act. Justice does not require it. It would not therefore be necessary to kill A because he had killed B. Any pain inflicted on A after killing B which does not have the effect to reform him is useless and unjust. Now as all that can be done with A is to reform him, and if he cannot be reformed without inflicting pain upon him, and if he died before he was reformed, he must suffer after death or never be reformed.

My reader will understand that I mean pain inflicted in addition to the natural consequence of the act which consequences by no torture of language can be called punishment. Whether A will require this additional pain in another world, I leave for those who know more about that world than I do, to determine. My reply is that A is not punished at all. He will probably suffer as long as he retains the disposition with which he killed B.

But can the sinner escape punishment? Yes. Can he escape suffering? He cannot, for he would not be a sinner if he did not suffer. Why certain actions bring misery I know not. That certain actions do bring misery every body knows. That these actions are wrong is admitted. That they should be avoided is contended not because we must be punished by a superiour Being, if we do them, but because the acts themselves are productive of misery. Hence the reason why we should avoid vice. Hence the argument why we should be virtuous. Vice is that which produces painful emotions in ourselves or others. Virtue is the reverse. All that is necessary to be done is to point out what is vice, and what is virtue, and our own love of happiness will determine which we should pursue. Hence if A becomes holy without any more suffering than was involved in the act it is enough.

CHURCH AND STATE.—No. I.

At this time when the agitation of the publick mind, on the subject named in the caption of this article, menaces some mighty convulsion, the patriot and the friend to equal rights, should stand firm and watchful, ready to repel every invasion on the rich inheritance left us by our fathers. The writer of this disclaims the character of an alarmist. He is not ambitious to be thought one of that number whose idle fears brood over imagined dangers, and conjure up monsters or giants at every step, armed for the destruction of our rights. No—he has confidence in the virtue, in the intelligence and the firm and determined adherence to liberty which characterizes the great body of the citizens of these United States. He would disclaim his country and banish himself to some desolate region if he thought the lessons of antiquity were forgotten, or if the memory of our struggle for independence were not embalmed in almost every heart.

The citizens of our country are attached to liberty, they almost idolize their government, and there are but few comparatively speaking, of our whole population that would not sacrifice their lives to preserve the freedom of our institutions. But paradoxical as it may seem there appears to us serious cause for alarm. Men are creatures of circumstance. Parties are the same. A party starting on the best principles and having the best object to accomplish, may, nay often do, in the pursuit of their favourite object, involve the most serious and even the most injurious consequences in their exertions.

We will not indulge in invective, nor will we waste our time in blaming those who now threaten us with the destruction of all for which we wish to live. The motives of men, the secret springs of their actions, are not exposed to our view, and we shall not assume the prerogative of the Almighty to look into their hearts. Their actions, their measures, are open to inspection, and we shall exercise our right to animadvert when we think them wrong.

It is said religionists are endeavouring to *unite* church and state. I do not believe this to be the wish

of those who manifest the most unfriendly disposition to our government. The Presbyterians are accused of wishing to unite church and state. I do not believe the accusation to be correct. They would reject with scorn any interference of the government with their religious affairs—except to give them money if the government pleased. No—their ambition, if they have any, is of a higher kind. They want no *union* but they might not refuse to *control* the state, to make the state subservient to their own views.

I see no plan on foot, which to me appears designed to effect a union between church and state, but the measures which have alarmed me, seem calculated to keep the church separate from the state, to raise up an ecclesiastical government which shall control the civil. The Presbyterian clergy, and I fear others as well as they, have a number of projects, for what purpose they were started I know not and care not. They were ostensibly started for the purpose of evangelizing the world. Thousands gave their support and thousands still give their support from this conviction. The object is ostensibly good. Men engaged to accomplish it, with the best motives and by exercising the best feelings of the heart. But there is not the less danger on that account. We have not less dread from the mistakes of conscience than from the violence of depravity. A man, conscious of rectitude of intention, fully convinced the object of his wishes is good, will hear no reason, yield to no argument or persuasion which might show him the danger of his course.

But where is the danger? Men love power; parties are actuated by the same passion. Our religious people have engaged in mighty plans. They have enlisted a great army who are all engrossed in the benevolent enterprize. Difficulties occur, obstacles to the completion of their designs are presented, they therefore will naturally labour to acquire power. To become able to control the civil government, to make that bow to their dictation, will throw an immense disposable force into their hands, and enable them, if that be their wish to establish their creed, or to gratify their ambition by the exercise of power, if that be their object. The natural progress leads to this result, and though thousands may be engaged who never dream of such a conclusion, yet their strong desire to do good by giving influence to their party directly leads to it, or will if circumstances are favourable. This is their reasoning. "Our object is most glorious. It is to advance the cause of the Redeemer, and to benefit mankind. We have the good of mankind at heart, but alas! we have not the power to do the good we wish, we must therefore increase our power." Thus selfishness seems excluded, and the conviction that they are increasing their influence for the benefit of the world sanctifies, in their own view, all their measures.

But there is a danger. Men ambitious of personal aggrandizement, and such men are never wanting, will join this party, mould its ruling passion to their own interest, and by making a skillful use of time and circumstance, they will not only defeat the good intended, but effect much injury. Here is the danger. The orthodox seem now ripe for some ambitious clerico-demagogue to execute his plans. By concealing his designs, adopting the watch-word, and making free use of the cant phrases of the party, and paying hypocritically the necessary homage to popular institutions, he may accomplish his nefarious projects ere many apprehend danger. This is what I fear.

Did the great body of our citizens believe there were any serious plan adopted to render the church independent of the state, to raise up an ecclesiastical hierarchy to overwhelm our civil institutions, they would rise in their majesty and consign it to nonentity. But the majority believe the thing is impracticable, and hence those who are suspected of the design defend themselves upon the apparent impossibility of its being accomplished. Our danger is in our security. Were we awake, were we watchful on this subject, there could be no danger. But we slumber; and those who would enslave us, are constantly administering soporificks, that they may be left to act unobserved.

I have been called to this subject, by a letter which I have just read from Dr. Ezra Stiles Ely, to a Mr. Montgomery in Virginia, in which the Dr. disclaims all intention or wish to give his creed a legal establishment, and also disclaims the same, not only on his part, but on the part of the Presbyterian clergy generally It little avails one accused of stealing, to declare he is no thief or for one accused of injustice, to say he is honest. Dr. Ely, however honest or upright may be his intentions, however firm his attachment may be to our civil institutions, has lost the confidence of the publick; and however much he may be esteemed by his party, his name will never, until he performs some extraordinary lustration, be free from reproach. As a man I know him not, as an individual, I attach to him no consequence, as the mouth piece of a party, he should be severely rebuked; and his projects should be treated with indignation. To spare him is treason to liberty. In his language is concentrated the violence of sectarism, the rancour of exclusive orthodoxy, and the impudence of benighted bigotry. He brands as *Deists* and *rejectors of Christianity* those who advocate equal rights, carries the reproach to the government, which he thinks will favour *Deism* sooner than any class of Christians. I shall bestow on him some attention, and promise my readers that the suspected union of church and state, or as I should term it, the usurpation of the church over the state, with what facts I can collect on the subject, shall be laid before them and fully discussed. The times require watchfulness and we dare not join with those who cry "peace, peace," when there is no peace. The publick mind must be fully aroused, or, we fear the gloom of monkism will spread ever the land.

VINDICATION OF UNIVERSALISM.

I would call the attention of that class of my readers who fear I am deistical, to the following extract from an article published in the Religious Inquirer, a paper which ranks high among the first publications of our order. The reader will find the line drawn between the Deist and the Universalist with sufficient accuracy. The observations made are liberal, and do

justice to the writer's heart, as well as his head. It is unnecessary to say, the editor of the Gospel Advocate can and does respond to the sentiment which it clearly states. It is enough to say, he is not conscious of ever having published a single sentence, when fairly interpeted which would contradict what is there asserted.

I have always written as I speak, freely and fearlessly. It is to me of no consequence, at least little subject of care, whether my sentiments approach Deism, or Calvinism, or Arminianism, or any other *ism*, if they are supported by facts. To awaken enquiry, is more my design, than to dogmatize, hence I labour to encourage investigation, and pursue that course, which to me appears most likely to arouse the mind, and call forth its dormant energies. I have never felt the least fear, that when the mind is free and active, that it will prefer falshood to truth. Therefore I have not felt as many do in reference to what I have written. Man must learn to decide for himself, and to confide only in his own convictions. All that writers or preachers, should do, is to present the materials for a correct decision and then leave every man to decide for himself—he will do well enough.

With regard to the Bible, I make one remark, and hope my readers will remember it: I have ever laid it down, in all my writings, that so far as the character of God is concerned, so far as it respects worship to him, together with our destination after death, the Bible is our only guide, and is, so far as we do or can know, both safe and competent. With regard to this world, our relations with each other, our duties as individuals and as members of society, I follow the Bible where it agrees with facts or where it gives directions, but rest chiefly on what is collected from the light of nature, the apparent constitution of things, the lessons of experience, &c. This may be Deism. But it is different from what those who bear that name profess. I hold the bible infallible where the light of nature fails. When I contemplate the heavens, I wish a telescope to enlarge, to extend my vison; but when I am examining my books, or the objects in my room, I feel no want of such assistance. When I wish to become acquainted with the affairs of the invisible world I take the Bible and follow it implicitly; when I look at the things of the earth, I am satisfied with my natural eyes. The Bible is my spiritual telescope, with which I survey the world of spirits, and regions after death. But when used in surveying the affairs of men it sometimes distorts the object and encourages the suspicion that its design was to view heaven and not earth. I therefore use my natural eyes wherever they can be of use, and take the Bible only when they fail.

My writings relate chiefly to the affairs of this world consequently little use is made of the Bible. When I treat Bible subjects, I use the Bible, when I philosophize I invoke philosophy. Charity, they say begins at home, to which I would add, wisdom also begins at home. Therefore we should first learn ourselves, become acquainted with the earth, and then we may carry our researches into the heavens to the full extent of our abilities. Such is the character of my creed, believe it, those who are convinced it is true, reject it, those who can produce a better, or show it false.—Ed. Gos. Adv.

[*From the Religious Enquirer.*]

The charge that we shall now notice, is the following; "Universalism is but another name for Deism; and Universalists are Deists in disguise." On this charge we remark, 1. That although the doctrine we believe may agree with Deism in many points, still the two doctrines may be widely different from each other. Universalism and Calvanism agree in acknowledging one God; but because they agree in this important point, it does not follow that the two doctrines are the same. The same rule holds good in the case under consideration.

2. Although we hold many doctrines in common with Deists, this should not lead us to doubt their truth. It has been urged by a Methodist clergyman, that the agreement existing between these two doctrines, ought to create doubts of the truth of Universalism.—But because we believe a Deist to err in some points, must we therefore suppose him to err altogether? Shall we deny the existence of God, becaus a Deist happens to believe in his existence? But there is the same propriety in rejecting this, as in rejecting any other truth, for the sole reason that a Deist believes it.

3. Although we repel, with scorn, the insinuation that we are Deists in disguise, yet we do it, not so much on account of our dislike to be called Deists, as of our detestion of hypocricy. We are not of those who seek popularity by a studied concealment of their opinions. It is absurd to say, as some do, that we are in fact Deists, but cloak ourselves in Universalism to gain popularity; for God knows we should mend the matter but little by so doing, as the times now go. If we were willing to sacrifice honour, for this purpose, we might better profess, like others, a more popular doctrine.

Let us now enquire in what points Universalists and Deists agree, and in what points they differ.

Deists believe in one God, the creator, governor, and benefactor of the universe. So do we, and we esteem it no disgrace to have it said that, in this point we agree with them.—They believe that God is *one* and *indivisible*. So do we. But some of our fellow Christians contend that there are three persons in the Godhead; that the Father was once dreadfully provoked with mankind, while the Son, at the same time, was so full of love towards them that he gave his own life for their good: thus they ascribe different passions in the Trinity. In this point we consider Deism, which denies the distinction of persons, and variety of passions, in God, more reasonable in itself, and more honorable to God, than Trinitarianism, which contends for both.

Deists believe that God is impartially *good* towards his children. We chose rather to agree with them in this point, than to adopt the opinions of *some* christians. They believe that God is strictly *just*, and "will reward every man according to his works." So do we. And we consider it an honour to our denomination that we agree with them in the belief that God is just, while we differ from such christians as believe he is *unjust*.

Perhaps they may not choose to say, in so many words, that he is unjust; but they *do* say, and that often, "if he had been just, they should long since been in the grave with the

dead, and in hell with the damned." If they are honest in this, they evidently believe that God is unjust; and their words, if true, further show that they have a very realising sense of their own wickedness. They also say that such as are saved, will never suffer the *just* punishment of their sins; in which case we hold there would be a lack of justice. Touching the justice of God, therefore, we hold Deism to be more reasonable, in itself and more honorable to God, than the other doctrine, to which we have alluded.

The above are the principal points in which Universalists and Deists agree. In the following, they differ widely.

We believe that in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, we have a sure word of Revelation from God. We acknowledge the Scriptures to be the only sufficient rule of both faith and practice. The Deist denies all this and holds the Revelation to be a fable.

We believe in a resurrection from the dead to a state of immortal life and glory. This is generally denied by Deists. Some, with Paine say they "hope for immortality;" but we believe we speak the truth when we say that as a body, they do not believe in the resurrection of the dead.

In these two points is there not a wide, yea an irreconcilable difference between us and them? We might mention more; but we consider these abundantly sufficient to prove, that although we agree with them in many points, yet the name of Deist does not belong to us, inasmuch as we differ from them on others, and certainly as important points, which lie at the very foundation of the system of Christianity.

We close this part of the discussion, by observing, 1. Our supposers are nuble "to prove the thing whereof they now accuse us." 2. We are not Deists, as we have shown; but we are honestly and sincerely, Christians. 3. We would infinitely sooner become Deists, than we would deny the goodness or justice of God, as someo, do and should consider that we honoured God by so doing. L. R. P.

[From Robertson's attempt, &c.]

OF ORTHODOXY.

Orthodoxy is a Greek word which signifies right of opinion: and hath been used by churchmen as a term to denote a soundnes of doctrine or belief with regard to all points or articles of faith. But as there have been amongst these churchmen several systems of doctrine or belief, that they *only* are orthodox and in the right; and that all others are heterodox or in the wrong. So that what at one time and in one place hath been declared orthodoxy or sound belief, hath at another time, and in another, or even the same place, been declared to be heterodoxy or wrong belief. Of this there are numberless instances in ecclesiastical history; some of which have been repeated in the foregoing pages; and we may only just take a transient view of the present Christian world to perceive many more instances of it subsistiug at this day. What is orthodoxy at Constantinople, is heterodoxy or heresy at Rome. What is orthodoxy at Rome is heterodoxy at Geneva, London and many other places. What was orthodoxy here in the reign of king Edward the sixth became heresy in the reign of his sister Mary; and in Queen Elizabeth's time things changed their names again. Various was the fate of these poor words in the reigns of our succeeding kings, as the currents of Calvanism, Arminianism and Popery ebbed or flowed. But the boldest stroke for the alteration of the meaning of these words was struck, about fifty years ago. Before that time Athanasianism, as contained in that wonderful creed, which bears the *saint's* name, was esteemed by almost every party amongst us, to be the foundation, and the very standard of Orthodoxy; and the bare doubting of any point of it, was deemed the greatest crime, and an effectual bar against all preferment in Church and State. But then Mr. Whiston and some other bold spirits arose, who confidently asserted that Arius was in the right, and Athanasius in the wrong: that the opinions of the former were the ancient orthodox doctrines of Christianity, and those of the latter were new and heterodox: and that the Athanasian heresy was the occasion of all the mischiefs that have plagued the Church, from the time of its first appearance to the present. The writings of these men have made a great alteration in the sentiments of the British nation. Athanasius hath since been losing credit every day; and the creed which bears his name is now very far from being respected as it was a century ago. For, although there have been no public declarations made against it, many of the clergy shew their dislike by neglecting to to use it; and some of the most respectable of them have, in their private opinions, declared against it; and the intelligent laity every where show their disapprobation of it. So uncertain and fluctuating a thing is orthodoxy. To-day it consists in one set of principles; to-morrow in another. At Rome it was wrapped up in mystery.—In Britain it is now set forth as the objeet of common sense and Reason.

But so much has been wrote upon the subject of orthodoxy, heterodoxy, and heresy by others, that I need not trouble my readers any farther about them. Were these words employed as they ought, in distinguishing virtue from vice, and good from evil, they would admit of no variation, and be forever taken in the same sense. But as they are used to denote *opinions* concerning the most incomprehensive subjects, no wonder that their meaning should be so often mistaken, and occasion so many endless and bitter disputes.

From the (Wilmington, N. C.) Liberalist.

EFFECTS OF THE LIMITARIAN CREED.

If it be true that the well being of society depends upon a belief in an eternal punishment attending upon crime—how chances it, that those countries, where to attack this dogma would be death, are miserable beyond idea, stained with publick and private guilt, reeking with murders, overrun with robbers and bursting with contentions and conspiracies. A cursory glance at the state of the nations of Europe, will instantly convince that in those countries where a belief in a Hell is the stongest, sin rears her unabashed front in the broad day light. View degraded Italy, ruined and priest-ridden Spain, trampled and impoverished Portugal—in these wretched realms the ascendency of superstition is supreme. Her throne is a heaped-up pyramid of human bones, cemented with the clotted gore of her victims—there sits the monarch fiend, and waves the the spiritual sceptre, and *men* bow down, and adoringly kiss the earth—red perchance—with a parent's or a child's or a brother's blood who fell a victim to the Moloch *they are worshipping!*

If a doctrine be *true*—the most undoubting belief in its veracity, the strictest observance of its precepts—must undoubtedly be *the* belief and *the* practice calculated to render man wise, consequently more virtuous—consequently happier. Spain and Portugal are the countries where they give most heed to "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils"—therefore if this doctrine be true, they are the most virtuous, happy and intelligent nations, upon the face of the globe. What is the fact? They are the most wretched, worthless, and faithless nations of the earth. We are *told* that *faith in the doctrine of endless* damnation, is the only thing to preserve men from sinning. They *have this* faith, as unbounded as the greatest friend of orthodoxy could wish, and they are miserable and sinful, and as their counter-revolutions testify, unworthy of freedom, *desiring* to be slaves;—and that to tyrants not only unfit to reign, but *unfit to live.* Ponder well upon these things all ye, and ye are *many*—who are well effected towards Universalism, abstractedly---but who fear its consequences as *a rule* of *life.* And ponder well upon these things all ye—and ye are but too many—who suppose that the only hope of the peace and well being of society, is based upon the fear of Hell.

A. J. M.

POST OFFICE IN LONDON.

In the late memorials to congress for stopping the mails on Sunday, great stress was laid on the circumstance of the London Post Office being closed on Sunday. We learn from a late paper, that the mails run in Great Britian, and the Post Offices are open on Sundays as well as other days, except in London. And the reason that the Post Office in London is not opened on Sunday, is because no mails are made up which would reach London on Sunday and none depart from London on Sunday. There are, however, eighteen Sunday Newspapers printed in London, so that the people of that metropolis are not left destitute of news and intelligence on that day. The mails are so arranged that all the news arrive in London on Saturday evening, and is brought to the doors of the inhabitants in their Sunday newspapers. It is not therefore on any religious or conscientious grounds, that the Post Office in London is not opened on Sunday, as the memorialist to Congress wished, no doubt, the publick to believe—*Reformer.*

Church and State.—Though we have seen many articles and heard much clamour upon this subject, we have not until quite lately, supposed that there were of any description of men, any considerable number who were mad enough to suppose that the American people could be brought to advocate a system which in the estimation of republican statesmen, has been more revolting than perhaps any other. But we are compelled to change our opinion. It has been stated to us upon authority which we cannot dispute, that in many circles in this section of country, there are warm advocates for this union of church and state—Men of respectable information and judgement have been prevailed on to believe that such a measure is all important for furthering the cause of the gospel. The argument generally used is this: "It is desirable to hasten the millenium day—the attempt to form the union of church and state will of course produce great commotion, and bring on wars and rumours of wars, and these must come before the millenium can begin." Whatever can be said of the cogency of this reasoning, it has certainly, so far as our knowledge extends, the recommendation of *novelty.* Among all the inventions of this inventive age, we have seen none equal to this for taking from the Almighty the management of those *times and seasons*, which we have supposed to be pecularly in his *own power.*—*Gos. Messenger.*

☞The name of *Elijah Olmsted*, our agent, South Le Roy, Genesee county, was accidentally omitted in publishing our list of Agents.

DIED.—In the town of Virgil, Courtland co. N. Y. on the 7th ult. *Jane Charlotte*, third daughter of the Rev. Joseph H. Ellis, in the 21st year of her age, and consort of Truman J. Beardsley. She was a prudent and loving child, a loving wife, and has left her husband and infant child, her aged parents, brothers, sisters, and acquaintance to regret her loss to them, but their loss is her infinite gain. And for their consolation, has left that lasting testimony, "That God is good unto all, and his tender mercy is over all his works." Psalms 145, ix. [*Communicated.*

Poetick Department.

THE SLEEPERS.

BY MISS M. A. BROWNE.

They are sleeping! Who are sleeping?
Children, wearied with their play;
But the stars of night are peeping,
And the sun hath sunk away.
As the dew upon the blossoms
Bows them on the slender stem,
So, as light as their own bosoms,
Balmy sleep hath conquered them.

They are sleeping! Who are sleeping?
Mortals compassed round with wo,
Eyelids, wearied out with weeping,
Close with very weakness now:
And that short relief from sorrow,
Harrassed nature shall sustain,
Till they wake again to-morrow,
Strengthened to contend with pain!

They are sleeping! Who are sleeping?
Captive in their gloomy cells;
Yet sweet dreams are o'er them creeping,
With their many-coloured spells.
All they love—again they clasp them;
Feel again their long-lost joys;
But the haste with which they grasp them
Every fairy form destroys.

They are sleeping! Who are sleeping?
Misers, by their hoarded gold;
And in fancy now are heaping
Gems and pearls of price untold.
Golden chains their limbs encumber,
Diamonds seem before them strown;
But they waken from their slumber,
And the splendid dream is flown.

They are sleeping! Who are sleeping?
Pause a moment, softly tread;
Anxious friends are fondly keeping
Vigils by the sleeper's bed!
Other hopes have all forsaken,
One remains,—that slumber deep;
Speak not, lest the slumberer waken
From that sweet—that saving sleep.

They are sleeping! Who are sleeping?
Thousands who have passed away,
From the world of wo and weeping,
To the regions of decay!
Safe they rest, the green turf under;
Sighing breeze, or music's breath,
Winter's wind, or summer's thunder,
Cannot break the sleep of death.

The following poetick article was called to mind by the recent death of Br. JOHN BISBE, of Portland.

DEATH OF A MAN OF GOD.

On Zion's holy walls
Is quenched a beacon-light,
In vain the watchman calls—
"Sentry! What of the night?"
No answering voice is here,
Say—does the soldier sleep?
O yes—upon the bier,
His watch no more to keep.

Still is that Heav'n-touched tongue,
Pulseless the throbbing breast;
That voice with music strung,
Forever put to rest.
To rest? A living thought,
Undimm'd unquenched he soars;
An essence, spirit wrought,
Of yon immortal shores.

Peace to thee, Man of God!
Thine earthly toils are o'er,
The thorny path is trod,
The Shepherd trod before.—
Full well he kept his word—
"I'm with thee to the end;
Fear not! I am the Lord,
Thy never failing friend!"

We weave no dirge for thee,
It should not call a tear
To know that thou art free;
Thy home—it was not here!
Joy to thee, Man of God!
Thy Heav'n-course is begun,
Unshrinking thou hast trod
Death's vale,—Thy race is run.

THE WIFE.

"She flung her white arms round him—thou art all,
That this poor heart can cling to"

I could have stemmed misfortune's tide,
And borne the rich one's sneer;
Have braved the haughty glance of pride,
Nor shed a single tear;
I could have smiled on every blow
From Life's full quiver thrown,
While I might gaze on thee and know
I would not be *alone*.

I could—*I think I could* have brooked
E'en for a time, that thou
Upon my fading face had looked
With less of love, than now;
For then, I should at least have felt
The sweet hope still my own,
To win thee back, and whilst thou dwelt
On Earth, not been *alone*.

But thus to see, from day to day,
Thy brightning eye and cheek,
And watch thy life's sands waste away
Unnumbered, slowly, meek;—
To meet thy smile of tenderness,
And catch the feeble tone
Of kindness, ever breathed to bless,
And feel, I'll be *alone!*

To mark thy strength each hour decay,
And yet thy hopes grow stronger,
As filled with heaven-ward trust, they say
"Earth may not claim thee longer:"—
My dearest! 'tis too much—this heart
Must break when thou art gone;
It must not be, we may not part,
I could not live *alone!*

From the Rural Repository.

FRAGMENT.

Mark you the mournful waving of yon tree,
Beneath whose shade the flower's in silence bloom?
It is a sight loved tenderly by me,
For 'tis a playmates calm and peaceful tomb.
The aspen leaves still quiver on the bough,
And the sweet rose and lily silent wave,
The hiacinth and ivy sweetly grow;
To deck with blooms a young companion's grave.

HENRY.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, MAY 16, 1829. [NO. 10.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

"But the wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."—James iii, 17.

Nothing is more valuable than wisdom. Solomon recommends the study of her above all things. "Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore get wisdom, and with all thy getting get understanding. She will bring thee to honour when thou dost embrace her. She is of more value than rubies, more precious than gold, yea than fine gold.—Length of days is in her right hand, in her left hand, riches and honour." This may well be said of that wisdom which cometh down from above. But there is that among men called wisdom, which is a libel on her character. A something, passes very well in the crowd—very eagerly sought by the vulgar. And she indeed comes recommended with much plausibility—with a variety of syllogisms and logical inductions. And we need not wonder at this; she has many schools in which she is taught; a great number of seminaries where a multitude of scholars, are regularly initiated into the best manner of presenting her to ignorant mortals. She has long prevailed. She has spread her influence very wide. She has generally been very fond of court decorations and sometimes leans on the arm of *state* to support her pretensions. She generally succeeds best where the wisdom from above, her opponent, is least known. After all, she seems not very fair in her mode of proceeding, for she always walks in disguise. She tells us she is true wisdom, and pretends she has all the marks of that celestial visitant. And she has succeeded too well. Base coin may be passed in the dark, or with those who are not sufficiently skilled to detect it, so *she* has palmed herself upon the world in the night of ignorance, and even now, in broad day light, she finds many who mistake her for what she counterfeits; yet she is so bungling in her execution, that I should suppose those of the least discernment might have *suspicions*.

But then she carries such effrontery in her very countenance, that she overaws the timid, and silences their murmurs. She begins by denouncing death upon all who doubt her genuineness—prohibits investigation; and where examination would detect her fraud, she draws the impervious veil of *mystery*, and forbids enquiry.

And then she has such a fund of impudence and assurance, that where she knows people have ascertained her to be a cheat, she denies it, calls those who assert it, "*fools*," fools in every sense of the word—impious liars—asserting that they know to be false, and warns people against hearing them.

Yet there are many marks by which you may know her. She is sometimes clad in her antique dress—she loves to pray long and loud "standing in the synagogues," if not at the "corners of the streets"—she fasts oft—she has a sad countenance—pretends a great deal of love for precious immortal souls—her bosom often heaves the deep drawn sigh, for the welfare of men—she pretends to great power—offers you heaven with all its glory, if you will fall down and worship—she tells you wealth is but a mere bauble, unworthy the notice of men that have souls to save—kindly offers to take all your possessions to herself, and save you the trouble of using them—she has her conventicles in which she is generally politick, but if she over-steps the bounds of prudence, she requests those who are present not to tell of it when they go away; she has great regard for men—prays anxiously for them—sends out her apostles from house to house, and sometimes imitates the cunning of the old preacher to mother Eve, by watching the opportunity when Adam is absent.

If you do not know her when she appears, you can easily ascertain where she has been, by the bitter envyings and strifes which follow. She leaves distinct traces of her progress—She destroys the peace and harmony of society—her footsteps were made in blood at the siege of Rochelle, and on St. Bartholomew's night—she left her *mark* on the ears and tongues of our first settlers and reminded others of her *presence*, by hanging some and banishing others still farther into the wilderness.

But, be assured, this wisdom descendeth not from above; but is earthly, sensual, devilish; for the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy, &c.

The wisdom that is from above is "first *pure*." She is one—she is no mixture—no compound

of heterogenius qualities—she cannot be transmuted—no chemical analysis can separate her, or lessen aught of her weight or bulk—put her into the cruicible, she remains the same—she is one—has one object in view, and one method of gaining it—her opponent is a commixture, made up of many discordant elements, which, continually struggling for the mastery, or tending to separation, cause her to assume a variety of appearances, and to adopt a variety of measures to maintain her standing. But this heavenly wisdom, conscious of the purity of her nature and design, never alters her course.

She is "*peaceable!*"—how true—O have you ever seen her? Has she ever laid her hand upon thy heart? Whither fled all the elements of discord? Whither fled all the jarring principles that before disturbed thy peace, and made thy heart a barbarous canton filled with war? How calm was thy bosom? How halcyon was the sensation that glided through thy heart, and imparadised thy whole soul? How quick did the tumults of life cease? What a lustre did her presence give to the habitation where she deigned to dwell? O how delightful was the love of parents and children, of brothers and sisters, friends and relations?—The little community was heaven and God was in each heart.

This heavenly wisdom is "*gentle.*" She did not frighten thee with the thunders of Sinai. No storms nor tempests encompassed her; no earthquake was heard; she was not dressed in sheets of flame, nor enveloped in clouds of sulphureous smoke. The thunder had ceased to roar; the tempest was laid—the clouds had fled in air away—all was hushed to peace.—Nature smiled, the sun looked glad upon the scene. She came—light she came; love in her eye, heaven in her countenance; her still small voice thrilled rapture through the soul of the anxious mortal. O christian, how gentle was that maid of light—she reproved thee not—There was no harshness in her voice; but there was musick in her voice, the sweetest thine ear ever heard; angels stooped from their seats of glory, to catch the joyous accent; even Jehovah gave signs of pleasure, when softly in thine ear she said, "thy sins are forgiven thee, go and sin no more."

"*Easy to be entreated.*" The wisdom from below is different. *Her* disciples must be at a distance, till they learn her jargon; they must submit to severe regimen; they must learn to loathe existence; they must become familliar with the most frightful scenes; their days must be spent in fasting and prayer; their nights in vigils or horrid dreams; the huge king of Orcus must shake his grisly sides before their eyes!—*Hades* must be uncapt; the terrors of the burning lake must be presented with all its vivid fury; the groans of the damned, the shrieks of ghosts; the howlings of darkened fiends must strike their ear; they must see themselves hair-hung, breese-shaken over the sulphureous gulph; hell yawning beneath; heaven blackened above; Jehovah hurling winged lightnings, frowns settling on his countenance, vengeance flashing from his starting eye-balls, while his awful hand grasps the sword unsheathed; the hair clipt—the sinner falls; devils shout. * * * * * * But now the sinner stands upon the firm rock. Thus the wisdom from below after causing her disciples to pass through this scene, permits them to hope that if they reverence her properly, none but their ungodly neighbours and their undutiful children, shall suffer that from which *they* have been so miraculously saved. But the wisdom from above never mocks her disciples—never sports with the children of men—she does not attempt to increase their misery; She says nothing about *deep* and *pungeant conviction* or pain; she keeps them not for months and years at the gate of hell. She beholds the unhappy mortal—pities the suffering soul, and ere he can ask, flies to his relief. With bosom bleeding with sympathy for the human race, she cannot aggravate one's misery by stopping to tell how wicked he has been; how awfully he has sinned—how angry God is with him; she "forgets his vices in his wo." "Son be of good cheer. God is thy father, thy friend, thy Redeemer, thy everlasting Saviour." Look up, poor forsaken one, behold the bow of his promise; dismiss thy fears, scatter thy doubts—thy Maker loves thee: His house is filled with rich provisions. He will give thee white raiment that thou mayest be clothed; gold, tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich. The wisdom from above not only permits him to *hope*, but she gives him a portion *now*. She fills his soul with gladness, and permits him to "rejoice and be glad *all his days*."

His heart melts with gratitude, he receives so much more than he expected, so much more than he conceived, that he says, "Of a truth this wisdom that cometh from above is easy to be entreated."

The wisdom from above is "full of mercy." The wisdom from below is implacable. This never forgives an injury; she is relentless in all her proceedings; she grasps the lightning—presumes to hurl the bolts of heaven at each she hates; she has an inquisition—carries wheels and racks of torture in her train; hereticks have felt her vengeance; dissenters have felt the weight of her anger; She paints her God like herself; she represents him clad in terrour, reeking his wrath upon his defenceless children, pouring the whole weight of incensed Omnipotence upon his innocent, his well beloved Son; she tells us God is angry every day; He is dreadfully enraged; His anger will not be appeased without the sacrifice of millions of his own offsprings to interminable

tortures; she tells she shall see their misery, clap her hands, exulting cry "Hallelujah," as the smoke of their torment ascends! Her bosom is a stranger to pity; she regards no tie, no relation, however precious or sacred; she insinuates herself into the domestick circle ---the sun of mutual affection shines upon each —the soft and heaven-like passions pervade each bosom; the smile of joy rests upon each countenance; they live in another paradise; all trees pleasant to the sight, delightful to the taste, scatter their fragrance and yield their fruit. Serpent-like she enters, coils herself around the tree of knowledge, and presents the "death distilling fruit." Confidence is gone,mutual reproach succeeds,the wife scorns her husband, calls him a child of the devil; the husband calls the wife infatuated—happiness is gone; cherubim with a flaming sword guard the tree of life!

But the wisdom from above is "full of mercy," her eyes stream with compassion, forgiveness is in her looks, pardon in her voice; she has no enemies, feels no injuries, remembers no insults; all are written in sand, or like the keel in the wave "leave no trace behind." The God she represents is enthroned in light, his face like a jasper or sardonix, his throne encircled by a bow of green emeralds.

"He looks, and ten thousands of angels rejoice,
"And Myriads wait for his word;
"He speaks, and eternity filled with his voice,
"Re-echoes the praise of its Lord.

He surveys the ruined world—sees his children plunge themselves in sin,lost in night; he hears their cries. Their groans ascend, they have forgotten their God, they have rebelled against their Maker, they have called him a hard master; the winged messenger of light is commissioned, he flies over the hills, his voice is heard on the mountains sounding through the vast immense---it is voice of God, "Ho all ye that thirst, look unto me all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved; for I am God and there is none else." Look, read your Father's love; there are no frowns on his countenance, nought but mercy is seen there---see his Son, the nails have pierced his hands, the iron is driven through his feet, the sun is hidden, the earth groans, no anathema falls from his lips—"Father forgive them, they know not what they do!"

She is "full of good fruits." Trees blossom —they promise fair—the vine puts forth its leaves, it hangs with clusters, they are *wild* grapes. The wisdom from below has leaves. "These three years have I come seeking fruit and finding none; cut it down why encumbereth it the ground? She leaves nothing to feed the orphan, or support the widow; like the Upas, she sends out her noxious effluvia, none approach her but from desperation. With her, autumn never comes, she has nothing for life—wrapt into the future, she can give no relief till we have "shuffled off this mortal coil."

But the wisdom from above is full of good fruits. She wastes not leaves or blossoms, she comes to maturity, she is ever ready to relieve the distressed, she tells of another world indeed, but does not reserve her benefactions till then —she gives us a hundred fold now; she bends over the couch of wo, soothes the anguish of the troubled mortal, enables him to bear his afflictions with a smile—She has bread for the hungry, clothing for the naked, homes for the shelterless—she is a guide to the wanderer, and leads the weary traveller to rest. She wards off the dangers of our infancy, makes our youth virtuous, manhood industrious, benevolent and humane—She smoothes the decline of life, and supports the decrepitude of age; she visits the lone retreat, calls the deserving from solitude, enters the lowly cottage, bears with her compassion and relief; She softens the rigours of a prison, and lightens the bond of captivity; She mitigates the horrours of war, and those evils she cannot cure, she will at least assuage.

"She is without partiality." The wisdom from below is partial; she has her favourites, whom she seeks to bless; a select few she loads with her gifts; she spreads her table, places upon it the bread and the wine; no crowd comes to it; there is a fence around, a thorn hedge; whoever presumes to pass, does it at the peril of damnation. Her language is, "stand by, come not near me, for I am holier than thou;" she contracts her charity to those of her own way of thinking; loves none but those who have her mark in their foreheads. Her God is like herself; he has his favourites; he has indeed made a provision for all; told all they may eat, but has sworn in the secrets of eternity they shall not; calls all, but it is only to mock them with their impotence. All were alike, all were starving; no reason could be given why one should be fed more than another. But his *free sovereign mercy*, chose a certain number to share the bounties of his table, the joys of his presence, and the glories of his kingdom. The *same* was pleased to pass by the rest, and predestinate them to everlasting death, "for the praise of his vindictive justice." He loves his elect; he chose to make them as happy as his omnipotent power could; he knew his elect would be delighted in the misery of their brethren; he determined to give the husband the inconceivable pleasure of beholding the wife of his bosom; the wife the husband of her love, tossed by demons in the fiery lake! He determined that the mother might feel her own happiness by listening to the shrieks of her darling child, plunging in the burning billows, screaming with pain—by seeing all she held most dear on earth, delivered over to the tormenters without mercy.

But the wisdom from above is " without partiality." All men are favourites ; she spreads her table—" come all ye hungry, starving souls, there is enough and to spare.—Here is no hedge ; the thorn and the bramble are removed from the path– God provides these supplies ; Jehovah spreads his table—he is a kind father, a universal parent—mark yonder sun ; what clime does he not visit ? God's bounty is not limited by his narrow circuit.—See how plentifully falls that shower upon the thirsty earth—the green blade starts anew ; more copious is his grace, more refreshing to the parched soul—his love is higher than heaven, broader than the earth, deeper than the ocean ; It shall last—eternity shall not see its end ; space shall not see its limits. He loved man when he made him ; he pronounced him good ; he gave him this earth for his habitation, he adorned it with every thing beautiful ; scattered, with a liberal hand, every thing wanting to please his sight, or gratify his taste, to warm his heart and enliven existence." The wisdom from above, like the God whose daughter she is, is unbounded in her benevolence ; the sufferer comes ; she asks not to what denomination he belongs ; she makes no enquiries respecting his creed ; she asks not what made him poor ; she sees what he wants ; she sees a neighbour fallen among thieves ; she asks not to what nation he owes his birth ; enquires not whether he is a friend or an enemy, she hastens to pour in the oil and wine, to bind up his wounds and make the sufferer whole ; she points beyond the scenes of this transitory life ; shows the blest seats, the mansions of glory, " where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." " There, sons of Adam, shall cease your toils, there shall end your labours, there your sorrows be forgotten."

She is " without hypocrisy ;" she is sincere in all she offers, honest in all she does. She never destroys widow's houses, and for a pretence makes long prayers. She does not disfigure her face that she may appear unto men to fast. She never tells people how much she loves their *precious immortal souls ;* she never tells them how much she suffers for their good, how anxious she is for their welfare. She does not represent how deplorable men would be, were it not for her assistance. She uses no arts of this kind ; her acts speak for themselves. She does not sound a trumpet when she gives her alms, nor publish them in the *publick journals*. It is enough, her bounty affords relief.

She does not seek to ingratiate herself by pretending qualities she does not possess. She asks no court decorations, no patronage of state. She needs no state policy to uphold her. She asks no revenue of lands, no *charitable* funds. She stands upon her own basis, clad in her own simple garb, she lives upon the tears she exhales from the mourners eyes. She spurns the tinsel, man would put around her ; She seeks to be loved for her own virtue and worth. Truth is her support, and benevolence her ornament. She lays her heart open to the inspection of the world ; she would not tremble were all her deeds written in capitals upon the broad expanse of heaven, that every eye might read them.

She is retired in her habits, modest in her deportment, and unobtrusive in her manners ; she asks no praise for what she does ; silent in her operations unostentatious, she continually labours for the good of man. She received her birth when time began—her office shall last till eternity shall cease. She came from Heaven, God was her father ; he sent her on earth ; he entrusted to her care his creature man. He bade her be his nurse from parturition to the grave. He bade her soften his heart, to instill into his mind, to infuse through his soul, love to God, and benevolence to man. " Be with him upon the throne, forsake him not upon the dung-hill—rear my child, freely thou hast received, freely give ; teach his hand to impart the ready gift to want, shivering at his door—his sympathetick tear to heal the mourners heart."—She entered upon her charge, pure in her design, peaceable and gentle in her manner, merciful in her disposition ; rich in her gifts : Loaded with good fruits for his support, she laboured to obey the command of her father without partiality or hypocrisy. Man was indeed obstinate, he was truant ; at times he seemed to have baffled her utmost skill ; but she succeeded ; the first obstacles are surmounted ; she shall prevail. The struggle between her and the wisdom from below has been long and painful ; it will continue yet longer, but the celestial visitant shall prevail. Her name is enrolled in the archieves of eternity. She shall stand before the host of heaven, honoured by assembled worlds, long after every vestige of her opponent shall be destroyed, and her name forgotten.

She shall remain ; her soft hand shall wipe every tear from every eye ; her voice shall silence every fear, dispel every doubt ; she shall pour a heavenly radiance around each soul ; she shall strike the immortal lyre of love ; the joyful Universe shall join the chorus ; the vast immense shall re-echo the strain. Brethren apply to her for instruction ; She is true wisdom ; she shall lead you to honour ; shall promote you ; she will make your lives long and useful. " Honourable age is not that which standeth in years, but wisdom is the grey hair, and an unspotted life is old age."

The Black River Association of Universalists will meet at Rutland, Jefferson county, on the second Wednesday and Thursday in June following.

Will some one inform us when the St. Lawrence Association assembles? We should like to attend it if we could ascertain when and where it holds its session.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

The Essay on Christianity, of which I have presented the readers of the Advocate with nine numbers, is discontinued for the present. When I promised this Essay to the publick I had no expectation of having all the arduous duties of an editor devolve upon me. But the removal of Mr. Everett and his delicate health which has prevented him from contributing as much as he had intended, have thrown a heavy burden upon the present editor, which he has neither the time nor the health requisite to bear without delaying for a while a discussion, which, to be what it was promised, demands all his attention.

If my readers will look at the matter which I have furnished for the Advocate since I became its editor, and compare it with what other editors furnish for their papers, they will discover I have written more than three times as much as they generally receive from an editor. This together with my duties as pastor of a society is more than my health will allow. The character of the Advocate stood high when it came into my hands. It was my ambition it should not sink. The publick approbation of my arduous but humble labours has amply rewarded me for all I have done, and would stimulate to even greater exertions, were I capable of making them. The patronage extended to the Advocate argues not only well for the cause of liberal sentiments, but has encouraged me to hope, though inexperienced, my course thus far has not been disapprobated by the judicious.

I shall hereafter publish more from correspondents and less from myself, or if I write myself it will be on a greater variety of subjects. I have numberless passages of scripture sent me for exposition; they have not hitherto been noticed for the want of room, but shall hereafter receive attention. I have a store of tracts sent to review, and pamphlets to answer, and such sort of things, which must either be neglected and the difficulties in the minds of my readers be unremoved, or I must discontinue some of my discussions which are not so immediately interesting.

EXCOMMUNICATION.

Dr. N. Wright of Washington, (N. H.) has been excommunicated from the Calvinistick Church in that place—for what? for any crime? No.—For immoral conduct? No—for something vastly worse: for having "left our (the Calvinistick) meetings and gone to *others*." Horrible!—*Christian Intelligencer.*

I copy the above for the purpose of noticing the consistency of *some* who boast much of consistency. Not long since two or three of the Associations in Maine, the state in which the above paper is published, with drew fellowship from the Rev. Abner Kneeland of N. York. "For what? for any crime? No.—For immoral conduct? No—something vastly worse:—for" adopting sentiments which those associations did not believe. Dr. Wright was excommunicated from the Calvinistick church because he did not adhere to the faith that church prescribed. Mr. Kneeland from the Universalists because it was supposed he did not adhere to the faith of Universalists. Which was the worst. The editor of the Christian Intelligencer approved the course adopted towards Mr. Kneeland by his order, but ridicules the conduct of the Calvinists towards Mr. Wright. Now where is the consistency? If he considers it wrong for Calvinists to excommunicate a member because he changes his opinions, let him not uphold Universalists in the same practice. Allow not ourselves in that which we condemn in others.

For my part, I condemn passing a censure on any man for his faith, and I care not whether it be done by our church or by another. And when I read of an excommunication or the withdrawal of fellowship from any man on account of his faith, by any church whether orthodox or heterodox, I conclude that church is more in love with its own opinions than with truth.

The sermon which we publish in this number was calculated for the longitude and for the time of what is known in this region by the Finney excitement. For the credit of human nature that excitement has mostly subsided, or rather has resulted in a powerful reaction.

The sermon was delivered in this village in June, 1827, and at the request of several who heard it, was published, in a Utica paper. At the request of several of our ministering brethren, and others, we republish it. Perhaps its descriptions may not be useless. There is still too much of the wisdom from below and too little of the wisdom from above. Whatever has a tendency to expose the hideous features of that haggard wretch which has been palmed upon us, and to exhibit the loveliness and utility of true wisdom should be encouraged. The sermon in question from its eccentricity may be read, and though laughing at all rules of composition it may have some effect.

We return our thanks to Amicus for his favour. We hope he will bring all the objections to our sentiments that he can find. Our readers will be pleased to see both sides of a question, and we are much gratified that Amicus has determined to come out and oppose our "false theories." We shall read him patiently, and when he gets through we shall reply. We wish to see his principles which he has stated in this communication carried out in detail, before we yield our assent or enter our protest. We are somewhat curious to know how he will reconcile the doctrine of imputed righteousness with scripture, with reason or justice. He will, we hope, have his promised remainder forth coming. If he convicts us of errour, we are neither afraid nor ashamed to retract. We have no *darling* tenets to defend. We entered the field of enquiry determined to embrace truth let her name be what it may.

Our *brother* of the Gospel Herald has concluded, we suppose, to keep his paper at home. We are perfectly willing to exchange papers with him, but shall make no complaints about his determination. We thank him for his liberality, and congratulate him on his approaching union with the orthodox, and on the strong claims he may have to be made grand Inquisitor when that

office shall be established in this country. As we fear the freedom of our enquiries may offend his infallibility, we shall no longer trouble him by sending the Gospel Advocate.

Rev. A. H. Curtis is no longer an agent for the Gospel Advocate.

Our subscribers will recollect the terms of our paper are $1,50 payable in advance, and $2,00 if not paid within six months. It will be well for those who intend to avail themselves of the advance price to recollect the six months will soon expire. Our agents will notice this.

Accession to the Ministry.—Jacob Chase, jun. of Onondaga county, N. Y. has commenced preaching in the ministry of reconciliation, and bids fair to be a useful accession to our number.

A powerful argument.—The office of the Trumpet and Universalist Magazine, at Boston, has been discovered on fire at three different times, supposed to be the work of some incendiary—some person zealous for the honour of God no doubt. This is a strong argument, one which elicits much wisdom in the wretch who fired the office, still we are inclined to think it will do little towards convincing Universalists that their doctrine is false. It may indeed teach them that if they will not preach *hell*-fire to consume the wicked hereafter, they shall have *real* fire to consume their property while here.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

REV. O. A. BROWNSON,

Dear Sir: Your letter addressed to me thro' the Advocate, I have attentively perused and cordially reciprocate the friendly feeling, and good wishes you have indulged toward me. It is true we honestly, I believe, differ on some points in theology, but I ardently hope in this correspondence our esteem for each other may not be diminished, but that we may keep an eye on the ultimate object, the discovery of *truth*.

Let me assure you it is with embarrassed feelings, and a "fearful anxiety" that I enter upon this subject, from the fact that you possess enviable advantages over me. Your education is good, your time is almost exclusively devoted to reading and writing, you have made divinity your study for years, and you have an extensive library. Of some of those privileges I am totally destitute, and those of which I am not destitute, are very limited. With such a "fearful odds" the question is, whether errour may not triumph, and truth suffer for the want of an abler and better qualified advocate. But to those who think me presumptuous, I have to say, let the love of truth be my apology.

The point at issue is "will God restore all mankind to happiness."

You say "He will—for he has the power, and if he does not, his goodness must be given up," and you argue that the conclusion is perfectly logical, that God, being "good, as such, he cannot make his creatures miserable, nor allow them to suffer, if he have the power to make them happy. He has the power, and therefore will." To which conclusion I take exceptions.

1st. Because it is contrary to the known moral government of God, or in other words, to facts.

2d. Because it is in perfect accordance with the goodness of God, connected as it is with his other attributes, to punish the wicked eternally.

3d. Because the revelation of God, which must decide the point, is against your conclusion. *Facts* are against your conclusion.

Evil does exist, and the misery and suffering are in consequence of sin; this you admit.

I ask then, if suffering, or punishment, for transgression, in some degree, be consistent with the goodness of God, for a certain period, who shall say when this punishment shall cease, in order that it may not encroach upon that goodness, or whether it shall ever cease?

You say the "term goodness means doing all in our power to prevent evil, and all we can to make others happy," and intimate if God's dealings to mankind are not according to this course, they are not good, and should be "called by some other name."

Let us compare the present state of things with this hypothesis.

Affliction, sorrow, pain, misery, anguish and death, are the "common lot of all men," but the manner in which these sufferings are distributed is very unequal. One individual, from "mad ambition" will wade through human blood, to gratify his pride; rapine and slaughter, attend him at every step; to him it is the same whether the afflicted widow wring her hands in agony, or the light-hearted damsel dance for joy; the cries of the orphan, and the groans of the dying, alike unmove him. He has the world at command, and the shouts of thousands proclaim his approach. No wonder David said he was "envious" at the wicked when he saw their prosperity, for "they were not in trouble as other men, neither were they plagued as other men, their eyes stood out with fatness, they had more than heart could wish, and they had no bands in their death." Another individual may spend his whole life in deeds of charity and in devotion to his God. He may visit the house of affliction and administer to their necessities; he may "feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick and minister to those in prison;" he may "weep with those that weep, and rejoice with those who rejoice;" "he may cleanse his heart in vain, and wash his hands in innocence," and yet "all the day long will he be plagued, and chastened every morning." But when David sought to know this it was too painful for him. "Verily," said he, "I have cleansed my heart

in vain." But David knowing that the "mercy of the Lord endureth forever, for he would render to every man according to his works," took a different course from what some of us do who are confused and troubled in our notions of theology; he went into the sanctuary of his Lord. There his notions of universalism were cured, for he saw their latter end. "Surely," says he, "thou didst set them in slippery places," "truly God is good to Israel, but as for me I had well nigh slipped;" and indeed if we were to judge from the appearances of the present dispensation of the blessings and afflictions of providence, without going into the "sanctuary of the Lord," we should be brought to the conclusion that the smile of God attended the wicked, and his frown was upon the righteous.

But you will probably say all this is "fighting as one that beateth the air," for I believe God will punish every man according to the deeds done in the body, either in this world or that which is to come, but not eternally. "I assume the position" you say, "that this evil is an objection to the goodness of God, unless it shall finally terminate to our advantage."

To this I answer, so long as punishment or suffering is admitted to be the effect of sin, do you not see that your creed holds out a reward as an inducement to sin, rather than a penalty against it. It simply says to the sinner, "go on, for though you must suffer for your transgressions "your light afflictions which are but for a moment shall work for you a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." This is a pretty good interest for transgression and rebellion.

But you say "God is good, as such he cannot make his creatures miserable, nor allow them to suffer, if he have the power to prevent it, he *has* the power, and therefore *will*." To which I answer,

"What can we reason, but from what we know."

We can form no rational conclusion what God will do but from what he has done and is doing. From this view of the subject, let us see whose conclusion is the most logical.

I say "God is good, as such he cannot make his creatures miserable nor allow them to suffer" one moment "if he has the power to prevent it, he have the power and therefore will." This is my "conclusion," built on your premises; but I drop my pen and look around me, facts tell me I have missed the mark, I must try again.

You said in your sermon "What parents could see their child doomed to eternal misery, and not be unhappy themselves," and this indeed is a very "convenient kind of logick," "but not wholly satisfactory to me" for I would add what parents could see their children writhing beneath the "hand of unseen power" and not be unhappy themselves, and I might argue how much less could God endure the sight whose "tender compassion" exceeds the natural parent's, as much as the heavens are higher than the earth, and yet for aught we know God is unmoved at this sight, while the natural parent in the grief of his heart folds his arms in despair.

But you may say "this is the effect of our constitution and not the effect of any immediate transgression." True, but remember your argument "God gave us this constitution."

But you "cannot see how a God of infinite goodness and mercy can *delight* in the eternal destruction of his creatures;" and who says he does? "But, if he does not delight in the destruction of any of his creatures, must we not abandon the argument, or limit his power or wisdom?" Certainly not. God always has, and does now permit many things to exist contrary to his pleasure, some of which he cannot "look upon with the least degree of allowance but with the greatest *abhorrence* and *detestation*;" and I would add, I cannot see how a God of infinite goodness and mercy, can permit any of his creatures to suffer for one single moment. Were it in my power, and I was conscious I would not be found fighting against God, I would destroy evil of every name and nature from the face of the earth.

But, you cannot see how it can be for the best, or in other words, what possible good can result from the eternal punishment of the wicked, and intimate, if this be so, God should not be called good. His goodness should be known by another name. I answer, I cannot possibly see how it can be for the best, to have a system introduced, that would involve misery in the least degree so long as for ought we can discover, (revelation excepted,) it might just as well have been otherwise, and I would not have believed it, no sooner than you would believe in eternal punishment, were it not that I am convinced of its reality, from the best of evidence, facts—and surely there is no great wonder in all this, for I have not been the "Lord's counsellor at any time." It is true,

> "God moves in a mysterious way,
> His wonders to perform."

But I think, I shall not

> ——— "In my scale of sense
> Weigh my opinion against providence,"

or attempt to

> "Teach Eternal Wisdom how to rule,"

for he

> "Is his own interpreter
> And he will make it plain."

It is enough for me to know that God does punish the transgressor, his mercy and goodness to the contrary, notwithstanding, as you would have it.

But I say secondly, it is in perfect accordance with the mercy and goodness of God, connected as they are with his other attributes, to punish the wicked "with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glo-

ry of his power," "where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched."

"The attributes of God, cannot be considered to be at war with themselves; all the Divine perfections harmonize with each other. God never acts from benevolence, to the exclusion of justice, nor from justice to the exclusion of benevolence, but on the scale of general good." If you say he must save all or his goodness must be relinquished, I say he must damn all or his justice must be relinquished; his justice which requires him to damn all, bears just as great weight in the scale of his attributes as his mercy, which requires him to save all: our errour is reasoning falsely. We disconnect the attribute of mercy from the attribute of justice and truth, which is wrong—we should remember that "mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

As the atttibute of justice is not dissatisfied with the salvation of the believer, so also the attribute of mercy is is not excluded in the punishment of the impenitent."

"David gave thanks to him that smote Egypt in their first-born, for his mercy endureth forever, that overthrew Pharoah and his host in the Red Sea, for his mercy endureth forever. Why? because in the destruction of their enemies the Lord wrought a merciful deliverance for his people, and it may be said the same, with the rebellious part of the children of Israel, also with the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, their destruction was for an ensample to those that should after live ungodly."

"Now in these instances of punishment there was mercy displayed, since one design of punishment was to deter others from sinning, and thus in mercy to promote the general good. But there was no mercy to the sufferers, to them it was judgement without mercy, wrath without mixture."

But probably you may say, that "limited punishment is sufficient, to induce men not to transgress and enlist them on the side of virtue." Yes, and one would think the happiness arising from the practice of virtue in the world, together with the promise of a blissful inheritance in that which is to come, ought also so to be a sufficient consideration even if there were no punishment. Do you think the punishment that fell upon the old world, upon Sodom and Gomorah, and the rebellious Israelites and thousands others, who have been swept from the face of the earth, by the immediate visitation of God, were sent upon them for the purpose of effecting in them a reformation? Just about as much as a man is gibbeted to make him a good citizen. The truth is, punishment is certainly sent upon us as a penalty, and this in proportion to the offence, and if the transgression of one individual could, disorder the whole creation, curse the whole earth, bring upon all "death with all our woes," cause the whole brute creation to groan and travel together in pain, I say, if the transgression of one individual could do all this, I do not myself think it requires a great stretch of thought, to admit that God will by way of penalty punish the wicked, according to his revelation to us.

I know no argument, that can be brought against endless misery, that will not bear with equal force against misery of every kind at least in degree.

Probably you may say it is easier to "break a glass than to make one." To this I would say, just unite the moral government of God with the free agency of man, and all these difficulties vanish at once.

Thirdly, your conclusion is not a legitimate one, and therefore wrong, for it stands opposed to the revelation of God.

But as I have already written much more than I intended to in this letter, I must dismiss the subject. Subscribing myself your sincere friend and well wisher.

JAMES LUCKEY.

Weedsport, April 25, 1829.

Reply to the above in our next.—Ed.

Mr. Editor:—

That man has no innate principles, observation and experience clearly demonstrate; that all human knowledge is derived from the operation of the mental faculties and the exercise of the sensitive powers, is a truth so obvious, it needs no argument. Hence, we justly conclude, that knowledge is discursive, and that it comes by a gradual accession, and not by sudden profusions. Therefore man must be a progressive animal, and susceptive of improvement; not only as respects his locomotion, but in regard to acquisition of *wisdom*, erudition and truth. From the limited means of improvement, considering the many obstructions that impede the progress of knowledge, it cannot be expected, during man's short residence on earth, much information can be derived, especially when he depends on the works of nature alone for instruction; neither can it be expected that he will become an adept in literature, merely from his own investigation. For such is his imperfection, such the fallibility of his nature, that he is liable to be duped by the deceptive tongue of error, and forced from the path of wisdom by her duplicity. By assuming the garb of truth, she betrays him with her delusive charms and seductive wiles, and leads him, inadvertently, from the path he would pursue, to her secret retreat, where, she fails not, to load him imperceptibly with her chains. As the acquisition of knowledge depends on the exercise of the intellectual organs, and reasoning faculties; and as these vary in their operations, so as to form different conceptions of things in different individuals, it does not require much discernment, or sagacity, to discover, that it is extremely difficult to form

a new system of ethicks, or to establish a new proposition that will receive a universal concession ; for although our opinions may coincide in the abstract, yet the deducible principles may cause us to disagree.

What is sufficient evidence, to enforce belief in one, is no convincing testimony to another. And as most of knowledge depends, in a greater or less degree, on evidence ; so truth can make but slow progress in this little Microcosm. I have said the short period of man's mundane career, attended with the many disadvantages and manifest difficulties, that retard the progress of knowledge, will suffer him to make but little advancement in wisdom, or improvement in the sciences or arts, and therefore, in order to exceed our predecessors, it is requisite that we should profit by their speculations, experience and observation. But the sceptick, who doubts every thesis, formed by ancient or modern erudition, and who attempts to draw, from Nature alone, a system that will lead him to the temple of truth, will prove of but little service to himself, or to his fellow men. For he commences back in embryo, and ere he beholds one glimmering ray of light, he gives way for a successive generation. Besides it is probable he will mistake his road and wander in the intricate mazes of errour, until he finds himself ingulphed in her miry pit, where thousands are immerged.

I have said that, although, we may agree in the abstract, yet, such is the construction of the human intellect, and such the form of the organs, through which medium it performs its native functions, that objects make different impressions upon different individuals, and hence we form different conceptions of things, and differ in our deductions ; I do not allege this is universally the case, but that this frequently is the result. Therefore we perceive that errour may have equally as many votaries to her shrine, as truth, which makes our advancement in the knowledge of *truth*, slow, toilsome, and almost discouraging. Inasmuch as truth cannot inculcate two principles diametrically the reverse, as she cannot form two systems or schemes directly opposite in their natures ; so we perceive that much errour, under the semblance of her adversary, has gained access to this word. Whatever, then, hath a tendency to destroy this malignant foe to human happiness, or whatever may snatch imbecile man from her iron grasp, is calculated to ease the world of a burthen, under which it has ever groaned, and to prepare mankind for the enjoyment of that happiness, which, as yet, they have never obtained. Now, as errour is in the world ; so he, who employs his faculties in the emancipation of man, from the tenebrious cells of ignorance, and snares of folly, is a philanthropist indeed : and, although he may fail in his enterprise, either by a deficiency of his own native powers, or in consequence of the opposition that may be raised by the united forces of tradition, bigotry, and blind infatuation ; although he may be unacquainted with the disease, and his nostrum, which he applies may serve as a dolorifick, rather than as an emollient, yet, judging from the motives that prompt him to action, he is certainly worthy of our gratitude, and merits our highest enconiums of praise.

From your asseverations, we should infer that your anxiety, to improve and meliorate the condition of mankind, had brought into exercise all your physical and mental faculties, that your life, your interest, and your all, were enlisted in their service : Yea that you are assiduously, devoutly and diligently employed in eradicating from God's moral vineyard, the noxious weeds that choke the vine of knowledge, and sap, from its roots, those lenient juices, which would otherwise heal the moral maladies of the world. This is a noble purpose, a design worthy the dignity of man. But sir in your zeal for the promotion of happiness —in your anxiety to restore the palsied arm— in your solicitude to ascertain the properties and powers of the human machine and the operations of the mind—to show mankind their strength, and to bring into exercise those noble powers with which they are endowed by the God of Nature, is it not possible that you, like your contemporaries and predecessors, may adopt an erroneous course ? Is it not possible that you may tralineate from the path of wisdom, to follow the counsels of errour ? While you are making your prescriptions are ye sure ye do not err ? Are ye sure ye have applied the proper mendicaments ? Is it not possible that you may be deceived and beguiled ? Knowing the weakness of finite mortals, and their fallability, I think you will acknowledge that it is not only possible but also probable. Hence you will not brand me with the fulminations of heretick, infidel, enthusiast, or bigot, should I advance sentiments repugnant to the opinions you have embraced. It seems by some of your articles that it is more your object to arouse to action those noble faculties of the soul which have long been suspended by those somniferous opiates, which have intoxicated and lulled them into repose, than to dictate to mankind in the pursuit of knowledge or truth. Whether by the zetetick philosophy you would introduce, you would expect to overthrow, in the end, christianity herself, and erect, on its ruins, the fabrick of infidelity, or to expunge the errours from the church, and present the religion of Jesus Christ in its pristine excellence, I know not, neither does it come under the jurisdiction of my enquiry.— But, however, since you profess to believe the Gospel, charity behoves me to suppose the latter. If it be your object to advocate the cause of truth and become her disciple, you should

undeviatingly follow her steps, whether they lead you in the paths others have trod, or in those of an opposite direction.

But sir, as this heavenly nymph of celestial origin, may lead us into an unknown wilderness,where human footsteps were never known to stray ; how cautious should we enter the solitary wild ! lest, peradventure, the warbling songsters of the grove might attract us from our guide, to ramble in the neighbouring avenues ; lest the mellifluous flowers that decorate the bosom of the earth, and impregnate the atmosphere with odoriferous fragrance might excite our attention, and draw us from the sight of our mistress, to grope our way like the residue of mankind, through the mazes of errour's labyrinth, still receding farther and farther from our destined road, till we find ourselves locked in the prison of absurdity.

You have entered your protest, I perceive against those doctrines which have long survived the wreck of time, which have borne themselves up under the shower of invectives that have been poured upon them by their assailants, and which have withstood the scrutiny of connoiseurs, for many ages : Yea, the *Rev.* Clergy find in you a warm, indefatigable opponent. The doctrines they propagate receive your menaces and derisions, ridicule and reproach. But Sir have all learned Doctors so sought after truth in vain ? Have they not been able to discover one faint glimmering ray ? Have they so long courted her charms without success ? And you have been able to win her smiles ? If so, then blessed, happy man forsake her not, she is worthy thy affections, thy continence, thy love. But Sir, in your anxiety to " root up the tares," I am apprehensive that you may " root up the wheat also." In making applications for the removal of a disease, we may administer a medicine that will be attended with more fatal consequences, than the malady we would wish to heal. That there are deplorable errours in the Church, no man of discernment can deny ; but in your energy and zeal to remove them, it is possible you may combine some truths with them, and endeavour to sweep them, *enmasse*, with a besom of destruction, over the precipice of forgetfulness. It is proverbial, that mankind, while opposing any errour, are liable to run into another similar in its nature, though opposite in its import. Because there are some discrepances existing in theScriptures, you will not reject them as a " fabricated falsehood," and because there are some erroneous, or false doctrines promulgated in the christian church, I hope you will not consider them all the products of designing men, introduced for sinister purposes, or as flowing from a " chimera of the brain."

Know ye not that ye aim a blow at sentiments, which have been so long propagated and established, that they have almost passed into self-evident truths ? Such as have received the support of the wise and the learned, for many preceding generations ? Do ye suppose that because man is a progressive being, that, heretofore, he has obtained no knowledge of truth ? If so, then, posterity, yea the present generation may bring the same objections to your speculations and deductions.

Among other tenets, that you have proscribed, I perceive is the doctrine of imputed righteousness, and with much pathos, declamation and virulence, you have pourtrayed its demoralizing tendency, its fatal, its deplorable consequences. But how far your enunciations coincide with reason, philosophy, or the scriptures of truth, or how far they are the deductions of sound logick ; I leave it to a liberal, candid, and enlightened publick to judge.--- But as I cannot agree with you in opinion, as no individual has appeared in the Advocate, to protest such sentiments, either because they *spurn* to hold a controversy with a *free enquirer*, or because they deem it unprofitable, or despisable to appear in such a publication. As I have supposed you to be liberal in your opinions, and to have opened your columns for the insertion of other's views,Ihave deemed it advisable, to exert my feeble efforts, to suppress errour thro' the medium of your paper, by opposing those false theories which are manifest therein. I have been thus plausible because charity has persuaded me to believe, that you are willing to know the truth, and to be governed by the same. AMICUS.

[*To be continued.*]

We should think the Reverend Mr. Stow would learn wisdom, from the frequent castigations which he receives from the pen of A. C. He was lately made to blush for the resemblance of his doctrine to that of the Hindo's, and the following, we should think, would convict him of ignorance, or of his inability to reason, or lead him to adopt a more rational creed than the one of which its authour or reviser could say " *Hoc decretum quidem horibile fateor.*"—Ed.

PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS.

Mr. Editor,

Sir—Having lately heard the above named subject discussed by our friend Stow, of the Calvinistick faith, and of whose doctrines the readers of the Advocate occasionally have their " memories refreshed," I have thought it might not be wholly uninteresting to them to have a partial review of his discourse. The propositions, reasonings and conclusions approbated by Mr. S. may lead us to adopt a similar mode, and to draw the conclusions which legitimately flow from his principles.

In the discourse to which I have alluded, it was contended that the saints would continue firm and steadfast in the faith, to the obtaining of eternal salvation : it was contended that no person, when truly converted to the knowledge

of the truth, would ever apostatize so as to be forever lost, or to be eternally excluded from the kingdom of heaven. The text, selected in proof of this doctrine, and used as a foundation of the discourse, was from 1 Peter, i. 5. "Who are kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation." This text, with a few collateral passages, was introduced as proof of his statements. It was strenuously urged, that in every instance, the love and favour of the Creator preceded the love and obedience of the creature; that the perseverance of the saints depended not on any thing they could do; that this perseverance was not the reason why God should bestow on them his favour. but the reason why they continue to persevere is, that they are kept by the power of God.

It was also strenuously urged that God had a purpose in all things; that, if the saints were kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation, it was because it was agreeable to the will and purpose of God thus to keep them; it was because God moved and excited them to persevere, not that he bestowed his grace because they had persevered, but he bestows his grace that they may persevere; their perseverance was first excited by the power and agency of God, he moving them to it by his spirit.

It was further contended that the reason why others were not made holy, and kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation, was because God did not choose so to do. He did not exercise his agency to make them holy, he did not move them by his spirit to persevere in holiness, through faith unto salvation. The whole of the discourse seemed to vindicate the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation; or, in other words, the whole drift of the discourse centered in this one sentiment, that the present and future destiny of the creature is suspended wholly and solely upon the will and agency of the Creator alone. A passage of scripture was now introduced to show that those who had been converted would be finally saved, at all events: Philippians 1st, 6th. "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." The purposes of God being clearly stated, the absurdity of the supposition was apparent that God should begin a good work in the elect, and finally fail of its accomplishment. It was contended that the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints is much more broad and liberal than the doctrine of the Methodists, who maintain that those who are truly converted may apostatize so as to be eternally lost; for the former makes the salvation sure to all those who are once brought to the knowledge of the truth, or regenerated; whereas the latter does not. The Calvanistick doctrine then was asserted to be more broad and liberal than the Arminians. But if we be allowed to put in a word, we should say that both systems appear to us rather narrow and contracted. Both prove "a bed shorter than a man can stretch himself on, and a covering narrower than one can wrap himself in." Both systems "rob God of his glory, Jesus of his name, and heaven of its joy."—We can show this by the same mode of reasoning that Mr. S. adopts in showing why God performs a good work, which he hath begun in his saints or sinners, who are of the elect. This Mr. S. makes appear, from the fact, that the work is good, and that it is agreeable to the will and purpose of God's immutability.

Now, we might ask, was it a good work in God that he gave his Son a ransom for all? If it was a good work, for what purpose then did he give his Son a ransom for all? Now, when we ask these "hot headed" Calvinists this question, instead of asserting with the bible "that the world through him might be saved," they tell us it was for the "display of God's glorious attributes." But if we insist that the bible declares that God gave his Son a ransom for all, that all through him might be saved, they forget their creed, and tell us as much about "state of trial," "probationers," "free agents," "provisions for all," and other contingent circumstances, which prevent a world's salvation, as any "hot headed" Arminian.

Mr. S. shows the absurdity of the Lord's beginning a good work in his elect, unless he keeps them through faith unto salvation. But how is it when God begins the "good work" of a world's salvation? Here it seems is no absurdity, though the Lord fails in its accomplishment. Does Mr. S, believe that God gave his son to die for the whole world? Does he believe that Jesus, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man? If so, for what purpose did he taste death for every man?

Why cannot Mr. S. believe that when God begins the good work of a world's salvation, by giving his Son to die for all, that he will accomplish this end, on the same principle that he believes "that when God begins a good work of grace in the heart of his children, he will perfect the same until the day of Jesus Christ?" He has just as much evidence of the accomplishment of the one as of the other. Mr. S. believes God hath chosen a certain few for salvation, on whom he hath determined to bestow the gift of eternal life, without any reference to any good or evil which he had foreseen in them, and determined to make them heirs of immortal glory for his own sake. With respect to the rest of mankind, he maintains that God never determined them for this end, but, on the contrary for endless misery, and to blaspheme his name as long as his throne shall endure! We do not mistake,—we have heard his preaching,—we have heard it often. If this be the doctrine of the bible, for what purpose then did God give his Son a ransom for all? The bible

says Jesus, was crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God, should taste death for every man. That God has designed millions of these to endless torments, is rather a contradiction in our way of thinking. The apostle John, knowing that God gave his son a ransom for all---a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, could exclaim, with confidence, " We have seen, *and do testify* that the Father sent the Son *to be the saviour of the world.* And the apostle Paul, that peace was made " through the blood of the Cross, to reconcile all things unto God." Can Mr. S. testify, and still maintain, that God, has designed, by far, the greater part of his offspring, for endless misery? We do not see how he can. Perhaps we are blind--It may be, because we are in our natural state, and make use of our carnal reason. If we were spiritually discerned---I mean calvinistically discerned, perhaps we could see clearly how this is: But as we are not, it conveys to our mind, the " *similitude*" *of a contradiction.*

Mr. S. sees the absurdity of the arminian scheme, in supposing that God commences a work of grace in the heart of the sinner, and then leaves him to perish eternally. He discovers the defect in the arminian system, but cannot see the same defect in his own. We might say " physician, heal thyself." As further proof of the final preseverance of the saints, he quotes, John vi. 37, " All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." Now, we would ask Mr. S. if he thinks the bible contains any more testimony in favour of the doctrine, that all those shall come to Christ and not be cast out, whom the Father gives to him than it does that God has given all things unto his hands? Christ not only declares that the Father hath given all things into his hands, but he proves this by the fact, that he " gave himself a ransom for all"---" a propitiation for the sins of the whole world."

Jesus says, " all that the Father giveth me shall come to me." Now, how many did the Father give to his son? The Father says to the Son, " Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Now how many did Christ ask for, when he gave himself a ransom for all? Will a universal atonement for sin, settle this question? Will the fact that Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man, tell how many? Is it not all?

If the objection be urged, that, although the Father giveth all things unto the hands of Christ, he does not do it for the purpose of bestowing on them the gift of eternal life; we answer, this objection lies in the very teeth of the Saviour's testimony. He declares that the Father had given all things unto his hands *for this very purpose.* He hath given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life--Yes; eternal life to as many as the Father had given into his hands. The apostle Paul declares, that eternal life is the free gift of God, and that the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. He argues from the fact, that if " Christ died for all, then were all dead, and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose again." " For to this end, Christ both died, rose and revived, that he might be Lord, both of the dead and the living." He declares that peace was made " through the blood of the Cross, to reconcile all things unto himself, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven," for the purpose of " gathering together in one, all things in Christ." He says this is according to the good will, pleasure and purpose of God which he purposed in himself. But Mr. S's doctrine is, that the good will, pleasure and purpose of God, is to make an eternal separation in the human family---that God gave his Son a ransom for all, a propitiation for the sins of the whole world; when at the same time, he had doomed a large portion of them to endless misery, by an irrevocable curse! Is this logick? Is this consistency? We prefer the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles. With their view of the subject, the scriptures harmonize, " God gave his Son a ransom for all, that all might be reconciled." Here is no absurdity, no inconsistency, no contradiction---all the attributes of the Deity perfectly harmonize; our Saviour died not in vain, " he shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." The covenant that God made with our father Abraham that in his seed (Christ,) should all the nations, families and kindreds of the earth be blest, is now fulfilled. The righteous are recompenced in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner.--Prov. xi. 31. Man is satisfied, God is glorified, Angels rejoice, and every creature in heaven, earth and sea respond, " blessing and honour and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." A. C.

We ask pardon of " A Friend to truth," for having so long delayed his communication, but it was accidentally mislaid and not found in time for an earlier insertion. We thank him for his favour, and hope this will not prove the last of his communications to the publick. We are pleased our Western friends have discovered the machinations of our Eastern bigots. We trust they will be on their guard. The slanderous notions propagated by New-England religionists, that the Valley of the Missisippi is inhabited by heathen, who are destitute of religion, deserve and we pray God, may receive meritted rebuke.—Ed.

St. Charles, Feb. 28th, 1829.

Dear Sir—

While looking over an old number of the

New-York Observer, a few days since, I saw an extract from the Richmond Visitor of the 8th of October last, which portrayed, in the most pathetick manner, the sufferings and privations of a home Missionary.

I wish, through the medium of your paper, to correct the mistakes in that publication — Whether they are accidental or intentional mistakes I know not: but so it is, that a great part, if not all, of that publication is destitute of what all readers of romance and fiction consider absolutely necessary to constitute a good novel: I mean, truth for its foundation. That part of the publication to which I have particular reference, reads thus—"I have worn out myself in the missionary service, and have not the means of taking a journey, the only way that remains of restoring my health, and indeed scarcely of procuring for myself the comforts of life, while I sink into the grave and leave my family—none knows to whose care, except that there is a God of the widow and the fatherless."

If the writer had closed his novel here, he perhaps never would have had it contradicted; but what he relates afterwards is what showed to me who the hero of the novel was. Thus far, not one word is correct, neither did this home missionary ever make use of such language (when he was in his right mind at least) as this, nor any thing like it. His conversation was always the reverse, and to his last breath he remembered with gratitude the kindness of the people to himself and family. He was provided not only with the comforts, but enjoyed the luxuries of life in abundance; and he has frequently told me that the people among whom he lived were kind and affectionate, not only to him but to all strangers; and this I know from my own experience, having lived among them for some time. I find friendship and hospitality to be two general characteristicks of the people of the western part of our Union. As to his occupying a frontier station, I shall only say that he resided within twenty miles of one of the most populous towns in the western States.

I am not pleased with contention, particularly of this kind. But when I see the most gross absurdities palmed upon an unsuspecting publick for the sole purpose of increasing the salaries of the clergy, then it is that I am constrained to use my influence, small as it may be, to check the power of men who would gladly practice the same impositions upon the world that history informs us were practiced in the dark ages, by that beast with seven heads and ten horns, the seat of whose empire was at Rome, under whose fostering care grew up the Inquisition, that national curse, the cause of the most excruciating sufferings to thousands of individuals, simply because their doctrine differed from that of the holy mother church. And is there not a holy mother church growing up in our own country? Are not our sons and daughters instructed that whoever disputes what is taught by the clergy is in danger of hell-fire? and that the only way to escape that, is to become a member of some orthodox church? Every man must acknowledge this to be a fact. But a few inferences and I have done.

If the reports of Missionaries who have been sent among the heathen are correct, the men who occupy the same station as it respects the idol and the worshippers of that idol, that ministers pretend to hold between civilized men and their Creator, are looked upon with respect and reverence by the people, and consequently their wants, and those of their families, are supplied. Now this home Missionary was a pastor of a church of near twenty members, and would not the natural inference be, that these people had become more unfeeling than the Hindoo or the Bramin? Certainly; every man must acknowledge that that inference would be correct. Now if these home Missionaries teach a religion which has a tendency to make men more barbarous than the most degraded worshipper of the Grand Lama, is it to be wondered at if they are not supported?

If civilization is a blessing, which every man must acknowledge, how destitute of all affection for his fellow creatures must that man be who would support a set of pretended clergy, for the sole purpose of destroying that, and instituting in its place a pretended religion to convert men, not from a state of civilization to that of christianity, but from a civilized state to that of the most worthless savage!— Can the clergy suppose that men are to be thus deceived? Can they for one moment imagine that mankind are so destitute of natural feelings that they will pray for the destruction of their own happiness and that of their fellows? And above all, is this the return which a generous publick is to receive from those sons of charity, who were taken from the haunts of poverty and degradation and raised to a publick life, without any of their own exertions? O base, black ingratitude! Well may human nature blush if this is one of her inherent principles—"and what man seeing this, and having human feelings, would not blush and hang his head to think himself a man."

I make these observations that the publick may know that many false reports have been circulated in the eastern States respecting this country; and, with this view, I submit it to the publick, hoping they will read it with candour, and judge impartially as to the points which are here touched upon, though but briefly. A Friend to Tuuth.

The following communication is from Jacob Chase, jun. now residing a few miles from this place in the county of Onondaga. With Br. Chace we have for-

med only a slight acquaintance. He informs us he has, for the two or three years past, devoted a large share of his time to the studies preparatory to the ministry. He has preached a few times. We heard him deliver a lecture in this village. We were well pleased, and we believe all those who heard him were of the same opinion with ourself. He appears a man of respectable talents, and of pretty critical knowledge of the Scriptures. He enters the ministry with much to recommend him, and from the specimen we have seen, we bid him "God speed," and earnestly pray the great Head of the Church may make him an able defender of impartial truth, a zealous and useful advocate of the faith once delivered to the saints.

It is with much pleasure we welcome brethren to the ministry in this section of country. Here is a vast field, the harvest is truly plenteous, but the labourers are few. Our population is enlightened and liberal. The Orthodox have drawn their bands too close, and nothing is wanting but able, pious and active ministers of the reconciliation to come among us, to drive the heart rending doctrines which have hitherto been preached, to that place where they may be, as if they had not been. God grant us such ministers of his word.--*Ed.*

FAITH AND LOVE.

Faith is the gift of God,—the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen. Excellent things are related concerning faith, and whoever is partaker of this heavenly blessing may with great propriety say, "Thanks be to God for this unspeakable gift." But, notwithstanding all the excellencies of christian faith, still, when compared with love, it falls far short of being equal.

What St Paul observes in relation to the superiority of the gospel covenant over that of the law, may, with the greatest propriety, be applied in relation to the superiour nature and glory of love, when compared with faith.

"Even that which was made glorious has no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth; for if that which is done away is glorious, much more doth that which remaineth exceed in glory." Yes, all the glory of faith, before it is done away, arises in consequence of ministering to love. It is the great temporary means which God hath ordained to promote that glorious end.

Let those who magnify faith beyond all proportion, so as to swallow up all things else, and who so totally misapprehend the nnture of it as to imagine it stands in the place of love, consider that as love may exist long after death, so it did exist long before it. The angels, who from the first moment of their existence beheld the face of their Creator, had no occasion for faith. Faith, in its general acceptation, is the evidence of things not seen—they had no need of this, neither had they need of faith according to its particular acceptation—that is, faith in the blood of Christ; for he took not on him the nature of angels, but only the seed of Abraham. Hence there was no place found for faith before the foundation of the world, either in its general or in its particular sense.—But not so with regard to love. Love, from eternity, existed in God, the great ocean of love, for "God is love." Love had a place in all the intellectual offsprings of Jehovah, from the commencement of their existence. They received at once from their Creator, to exist and to love.

Faith had no place in Paradise—that is, in its general sense. It is highly probable, from the short account which we have in holy writ, that Adam walked with his God by sight and not by faith He was then blessed with the opportunity of conversing face to face with him whose face we cannot now see and live.

He, therefore, had no need of that faith whose office is now to supply the want of sight. On the other hand, it is absolutely certain faith, in its particular sense, had then no place. For, in that sense, it necessarily presupposes sin, and opposition to all good, without which there would have been no need of an atonement, for an atonement is made to reconcile sinners. Hence, as there was no need of an atonement before man had sinned, so there could have been no place for the exercise of faith in that atonement, man then being pure from every stain of sin. But love, even then, filled his heart; it reigned in him without a rival. And it was only when love was lost by sin, and the mind of man became darkened, that faith in God was given, by which he might view himself justified through the atonement by which "life and immortality were brought to light." After man had sinned, he received this evidence of things not seen, which before was altogether needless—this confidenee in redeeming love, which could not possibly have any place till the promise was made, that "the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head." Faith, then, was originally designed to re-establish the law of love. Therefore, in speaking thus of faith, I am not undervaluing it, or robbing it of its due praise; but on the contrary, showing its real value, and giving it the place for which the wisdom of God originally designed it.

It may follow, from what I have said, that faith in itself is of no value. Yet as it has a tendency to establish anew the law of love in the heart of man, and as, in the present state of things, it is the only means under heaven of effecting this end, it is an unspeakable blessing. But still it is inferiour to love, as the means can never be more valuable than the end to be accomplished.

"Faith may be lost in sight, hope end in fruition," yet charity or love shall extend to the latest period of eternity. "A new command give I unto you," says Christ, "that ye love one another;" "love worketh no ill to its neighbour;" "love is the fulfilling of the law."—This heaven born or eternally existing princi-

ple may I ever be found to cherish towards God and men. J. CHASE, Jr.

We do not pretend to understand all that is in the two articles which follow, but being very well pleased with what we do understand, we think it is very probable the unintelligible part may be equally as pleasing to those who are spiritually discerned. The sentiments are in part new to us, and we wish the writers to develope their views more freely—we thank them for the communications.—Ed.

The first work, or beginning of the redeeming love of God, is in that Immanuel, or God with us, given to the first Adam, as the seed of the woman, which in him, and all his posterity, should bruise the head, and overcome the life of the serpent in our fallen nature. This is love indeed, because it is universal, and reaches every branch of the human tree, from the first to the last man, that grows from it.

Miserably as mankind are divided, and all at war with one another, every one appropriating God to himself, yet they have but one God, who is the spirit of all, the life of all, and the lover of all. Men may divide themselves, to have God to themselves, they may hate and persecute one another for God's sake; but this is a blessed truth, that neither the hater, nor the hated can be divided from the holy God, who with an unalterable meekness, patience, and good will towards all, waits for all, calls all, redeems all, and comprehends all, in the outstretched arms of his love. Ask not therefore how we shall enter into this religion of love and salvation, for it is itself entered into us, it has taken possession of us, from the beginning. It is Immanuel in every human soul, it lies as a treasure of heaven, and eternity, in us; it can not be divided from us, neither by the power of angels, nor men, nor devils. We can not lose it ourselves, it will never leave us, nor forsake us. This is the open gate of our redemption, we have not far to go to find it. It is every man's own treasure, it is a root of heaven, a seed of God, sown into our souls at our natural birth by God, and like a small grain of mustard seed, has a power of growing to be a tree of life. Mark and observe, where and what the true nature of religion is, its place is within, its work, and effect is within, its glory, its life, its perfection is all within; it is merely and solely the raising or bringing to light the divine life in our souls.

Religion, (which is solely to restore man to his first, and right state in God,) had its beginning and first power, from the seed of the woman to the treader on the serpent's head, and therefore all its progress, from its beginning to its last finished work, is, and can be nothing else, but the growing power and victory of the seed of the woman, over all the evil brought by the serpent into our human nature.

For the seed of the woman, is the spirit, power, and life of God, given and breathed again into man, to be the raiser and redeemer of that first life, which he had lost. This was the spiritual nature of religion in its first beginning, and this alone is its whole nature to the end of time; it is nothing else, but the power, life, and spirit of God working and reviving life in the fallen soul, and driving all its evil out of it.

This is the true rock, on which the church of Christ is built, this is the one church, out of which there is no salvation, and against which the gates of hell can never prevail. Let religion have ever so many shapes, forms or reformations, it is no true divine service, no proper worship of God, has no good in it, can do no good to man, can remove no evil out of him, raise no divine life in him, but so far as it serves, worships, conforms, and gives itself up to this operation of God, as living and dwelling in the soul.

We must seek for no good, no comfort, but in the inward awakening of all that is holy and heavenly in our hearts, and then so much as we have of this inward religion, so much we have of a real salvation. For salvation is only a victory over nature, so far as we resist and renounce our own vain, selfish, and earthly nature, so far as we overcome all our own natural tempers of the old man, so far God enters into us, lives, and operates in us; he is in us the light, the life, and the spirit of our souls, and we are in him that new creature, that worships him in spirit and in truth.

H. Porter.

Every man in this world, stands essentially in heaven and in hell, both as to that which is within him, and that which is without him—For man and the world are both in the same fallen state. The curse in the earth is that same thing in outward nature, that the loss of the divine life was to the soul of Adam.

The whole world, in all its nature is nothing else but a real mixture of heaven and hell---The sun and the water of this world, is that which keeps under, and overcomes the darkness, wrath and fire of hell, and carries on the vegitable and animal life that is in it—The light of the sun blesses all the workings of the elements, and the cool softening essence of the water keeps under the fire, and wrath of nature.

In all animal creatures the birth of light is their own life, and the water of their own blood, both produced by the light of the sun, and the water of outward nature, brings forth an order of earthly creatures, that can enjoy the good that is in this world, in spite of the wrath of hell, and the malice of devils—But man has more than all this, for being at first created an angel, and intended by the mercy of God to be an angel again, has the light of heaven, and the water of eternal life, both given to Adam in the seed of the woman, which

was to bruise the head of the serpent, that is to overcome the curse, the fire and wrath, or hell, that was awakened in the fallen soul.—So man has not only in common with other animals, the light and water of outward nature to quench the wrath of his own life in this wicked world, but he has the meekness, the light, the love, the humility of Jesus Christ, as a seed of life born in his soul, to bring forth that first image of God, in which Adam was created. It may be known with a mathematical certainty, that the one thing necessary for every fallen soul, is to die to all the life that we have from this world, that the life of heaven may be again brought to life in the soul.

The life of this world, is the life of the beast, scarlet whore, the old serpent, and the fiery dragon. Much learned pains has been often taken to prove Rome, or Constantinople, to be the seat of the beast, the Anti-Christ the scarlet whore, &c. But alas, they are not at such a distance from us, they are the properties of fallen human nature, and are all of them alive in our own selves, till we are dead or dying to all the spirit, and tempters of this world; for covetousness and sensuality of all kinds, are the very devouring beasts, religion governed by a worldly, trading spirit, and gratifying the partial interests of flesh and blood, is nothing else but the scarlet whore; guile and craft, and cunning, are the very essence of the old serpent; self-interest and self-exaltation are the whole nature of anti-christ; pride, persecution wrath, hatred, and envy, are the very essence of the fiery dragon. THEOPHILUS

Poetick Department.

SONG OF THE SPRING.

I come! I come! on joyous wing
In Eden's gay appearing;
At my approach the shivering form
Of Winter robed in cloud and storm,
In consternation flies the plain;
I burst the fountain's icy chain,
And nature from her dark repose
Comes forth, to life and joy like those
Who from the dreamless tomb arise,
To the bright air of Paradise.
I come! I come! and shouts of mirth,
Are bursting from the tribes of earth,
I come with song of gentle birds,
And uncouth low of lazy herds,
With flying clouds and fattening shower
Changing with every changing hour;
And flowerets gay like timid brides,
And blushing on the warm hill-sides,
And grateful odours fill the air
As twilight falls in silence there.
I come! I come! while dews of morn
Are glistening on the shooting corn,
And sweet among the sun-touched vales
Are wooings light of balmy gales.
I come on wings of golden light;
And gentle zephyrs aid my flight,
From blissful Eden's spicy bowers,
With song of bird and scent of flowers,
And waving tree-tops bud and bloom,—
And scatter wide their rich perfume.

FROM THE CAYUGA PATRIOT.

STANZAS,

BY J. M. D.

I love to wander through the grove,
When deck'd with vernal green;
And, o'er the smiling landscape rove,
When nature looks serene.

I love to climb the lofty hill,
And stand upon its brow,
While feather'd songsters sweetly trill,
And zephyrs gently blow.

I love to contemplate that power,
Whence all creation sprung,
The life of ev'ry plant and flower,
The theme of ev'ry tongue.

I love to hear the rill complain
In murmurs soft and slow,
And listen to the lab'ring swain,
Caroling at his plough.

Far from the busy scenes of life,
How sweet it is to stray
From hurry, tumult, care and strife,
That steal our thoughts away.

The Saviour frequently retired
To mountains high and lone,
With love of solitude inspired,
When busy day had flown.

Angels, upon their golden wings,
Descending from above,
Conversed with him of heav'nly things,
Of mercy, truth and love.

'Tis here the eye delights to trace
The wond'rous works of God,
While nature, deck'd with vernal grace,
Proclaims his power abroad.

On contemplation's rapid wings
Our tow'ring minds arise,
And leave all sublunary things
To wander through the skies.

Those vast ethereal worlds of light,
Those countless spheres that roll;
We contemplate them with delight,
They captivate the soul.

They teach us to adore the hand,
Almighty and supreme,
That with unlimited command,
Controls this spacious frame.

Hence we our homeward course pursue,
All placid and serene;
The mind prepared for studies new,
For ev'ry changing scene.

Such pleasurable walks as these,
The senses sweet regale;
Retard the progress of disease,
And make us sound and hale.

Full many a heart both gay and blithe
At early dawn appears;
Shines through the morn and noon of life,
Then sinks and sets in tears.
Full many a heart in clouds of care,
Have dawned from sorrow's night,
Burst from the gloom of black despair
And sunk in beams of light.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U.F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1829. [NO. 11.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

BY MENZIES RAYNER.

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.—Matthew xxv. 46.

There is no one passage in all the bible so often quoted as this, in proof of the certainty, and the endless duration of punishment and misery in a future state. It is referred to in a sort of triumph, as containing proof positive of the truth of the doctrine; and any attempt to illustrate the passage in a different way; or any intimation, that possibly it may admit of a consistent explanation which shall not necessarily embrace the above mentioned doctrine, is considered as the infidel attempt of the enemies of religion to evade the force of a truth, which if admitted would leave them without any hope of futurity: whilst the advocates of the doctrine of endless misery, appear to grasp it with as much tenacity, and to be as anxious to substantiate it, as if their eternal salvation depended upon it. Now if the doctrine be true, and if it be fully declared in scripture, as many suppose, then it can be no extraordinary credit to them to believe it; for to believe a thing upon sufficient evidence, is not very meritorious. And on the other hand to disbelieve a proposition, when the evidence does not appear conclusive, and to which there are apparently reasonable objections, cannot be *very* criminal.

Among the different denominations of christians, there must be a good deal of false faith, because they believe many different, and even opposite doctrines. Yet none but a bigot will deny that there may be real piety among them all. For a man to suppose that he is any more safe, merely because he believes in endless punishment, even if the doctrine were true, discovers very great ignorance and presumption. His faith in it, will certainly never save him. Yet it really appears as if some think *they* are going straight to heaven, principally because they believe *others* are going to hell: that is, because *they* are of the orthodox faith whilst *others*, they suppose are hereticks, and consequently reprobates. It is not yet, I apprehend quite evident, that the believers in endless torments are more remarkable for the uprightness and integrity of their conduct, the placidness of their tempers, or their candour, benevolence, humility and charity, than others, of a different, or opposite faith. Where then is the evidence of their superiour goodness? On what are their claims to peculiar favour predicated? And wherein appears the intrinsick worth, or the salutary effects of the doctrine, if it neither brings consolation to the mind, nor tends to sanctify its temper and affections, nor to influence and regulate, in any extraordinary degree, the outward conduct, and deportment.

Still, if the doctrine of future and endless punishment is contained in the scriptures, we acknowledge that it ought to be received as true, however terrible it may appear, however inconsistent it may *seem* to us to be with the acknowledged attributes of the Deity; and however repugnant to the principles and the dictates, even of human benevolence. But then it is obvious to remark, that upon the supposition that the doctrine is true, and that it is important, and as salutary as it is thought to be; we have a right to expect that it would be *plainly*, and *repeatedly* asserted in the scriptures; not merely in figurative representations, and in connections which admit of a different construction, and application; but in express unambiguous, and undeniable declarations; of the meaning of which, there can be no doubt or uncertainty. The destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jewish nation—calamities infinitely less than endless punishment and torture, are declared by our Saviour, with all the plainness and particularity of certain facts. "The time shall come, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down. They shall fall by the edge of the sword; and shall be carried captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Do we find future and endless punishment, thus positively, particularly, and unambiguously declared in the scriptures? We think not, in a single instance. But *if true*, we should expect to find it repeatedly, and constantly declared, in the plainest terms, in all parts of the bible. This is remarkably the case with respect to other peculiarly important doctrines. As for

instance ; the doctrine of the divine unity. This is found both in express terms, and in language which necessarily implies it, in all parts of the scriptures, both of the old and new Testament. This is so plainly revealed, that all who profess their faith in divine revelation, agree, with one consent, that there is one God only, although many think the scriptures justify them in believing that this one God, exists in three equal persons.

The scriptures every where declare the divine attributes, and especially the infinite mercy and love of God towards the human race ; they contain also the most particular and explicit descriptions of the Messiah, the appointed Mediator berween God and men. The important doctrine of the future resurrection of *all men*, is unequivocally asserted, and, as predicated on the resurrection of *Christ*, is constantly referred to, both as the foundation and the grand consummation of the christian hope. We say therefore, that upon the 'supposition that the doctrine of futnre and endless punishment were true, and that it is as important and salutary as it is thought to be, we should have a right to expect that it would be found plainly and repeatedly asserted, in express and undeniable declarations, in all parts of the scriptures. But is this the fact ? So far from it, my brethren, the fact is admitted that punishment in a future state is not once asserted, or threatened in all the scriptures of the *Old Testament*. This is admitted by the first writers in the ranks of Orthodoxy. It is admitted by Dr. Campbell of Scotland, and by Rev. Mr. Stuart of Andover. Nor are there any at the *present* day, as far as I have known or heard, who attempt to prove the doctrine by an appeal to the Old Testament, the writings of Moses and the Prophets. But what is the inference arising from the admission of this fact ? It is clearly this ; either that all who lived under that revelation are saved, or else that a part of them are condemned to a place or state of punishment in another world, with which they had never been threatened, and without any previous warning of their danger, that they might escape it. What was the general tenor of the language of Moses to the Israelites, whom with great reason he often calls a rebellious people ? It was in substance, as follows : that if they would fear the Lord and be obedient, they should be prosperous and happy above all people ; but that if they should be disobedient and rebellious, and serve other gods, then they should be visited with evil diseases and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance ; should be cursed in their basket and their store,—should be scattered among all nations of the earth, a hissing and a by-word, and a reproach among all people. Why did he not rather tell them they should go to hell and be damned, and suffer the vengeance of an angry God, in a lake of fire and brimstone, to all eternity ? Now if Moses knew, or believed any thing about the doctrine of future punishment and misery, in another world, or of a hell of endless torments, I know not how to excuse his neglect in not faithfully warning the people of his charge, of these dreadful sufferings in another world. Who knows but it would have frightened the people into obedience—caused them to love God with all their hearts, and produced as great a revival of religion among them, as this kind of preaching is thought to do in these days of the gospel.

The truth is, Moses knew nothing of this doctrine, supposed to be so salutary and important ; he was not taught it by God, and therefore he taught it not to others. What was the language of the prophets ? The substance was this ; if ye will be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land ; but if ye be disobedient and rebellious, ye shall be devoured by the sword, by the famine and by the pestilence, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. Not a word about hell, and the devil, an damnation in a future state. How can this be accounted for, if mankind were *then*, as well as now, exposed to, and in danger of eternal torments ? But, as was before remarked, it is acknowledged, by authority which will scarcely be questioned, that this doctrine is not taught in the old Testament, that not a vestige of it can be found there : even the famous passage in the 12th chapter of the prophecy of Daniel, (the strongest that can be found,) is now admitted by the advocates of this doctrine to be a prophetick, and highly figurative description of the destruction of the Jewish polity and the establishment of the christian dispensation, or reign of the Messiah.

But perhaps the tremendous doctrine of infinite punishment, and God's everlasting wrath, was reserved for the new Testament, or gospel revelation. This must be allowed to be most improbable, and utterly inconsistent with the comparison which St. Paul makes between the legal, and the evangelical dispensation : the former of which he calls the ministration of the *letter*, of *condemnation*, and of *death;* and the latter, the ministration of the *spirit* of *righteousness*, and of *life*. If then, the fearful doctrine of endless misery cannot be found in *that* rigorous system, which engendered a spirit of bondage to *fear*, its advocates might well despair of finding it in that comparatively mild and paternal system, the true principles and spirit of which, teach to cry abba, father : A dispensation emphatickally denominated the *perfect law of liberty ;* and the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, making free, or delivery from the law of sin and death. In short if the *law* in all its severity, never, in its threatenings, pursued the offender beyond the present life, shall we expect to find the appalling doctrine of eternal death, and interminable torture, in the gospel—the glad tidings of peace

and good will to men? The supposition is absurd in the extreme. Yet the same writers who admit that punishment in a future state, is not threatened in the *Old* Testament, strenuously contend that it is clearly revealed and fully declared in the *New*; that is *plainly*, the gospel is more rigorous, and more terrible in its threatenings and denunciations than the law. But if so, the Old Testament is better than the New; and the law is preferable to the gospel; for the former threatened only temporal troubles and calamities, whilst the latter reveals an eternity of misery and sorrow. But can this be believed? Must there not be some mistake in it? Can it be possible, that the *gospel*, foretold to *Adam*, and to *Abraham*, as the sum of all blessings; celebrated in rapture by the prophets; proclaimed by angels in strains of immortal eloquence; attested by the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus of Nazareth—the long promised Messiah, the unspeakable gift of God to a sinful world; disseminated with ardour and invincible zeal by the "glorious company of the Apostles," who, like angels flying through the midst of heaven, declared the glad tidings in every quarter of the earth; not counting their lives dear, that they might complete their ministry, and testify to every creature, this gospel of the grace of God? Can it be possible that this gospel unfolds to mankind, scenes of horrour unknown before, and clothes the Creator, the Supreme Majesty of heaven and earth, in terrours of wrath and vengeance, in which no former revelation ever represented him? It is impossible,—it cannot be.—It is an outrage upon the genius and character of christianity, and a libel upon the very name of gospel, which *is*, and forever *will be* good tidings, without any mixture of evil; and which, according to the evangelical declaration, shall be *great joy* to *all* people.

The Apostles undoubtedly understood their commission. After the resurrection of our Saviour, and according to his direction, they tarried in Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high. They were all filed with the holy ghost. They spake with new tongues. A divine and miraculous influence, rested upon them, and continued with them, guiding them into all the truth, and bringing all things which Christ had said or taught, to their remembrance. They were instructed what doctrines to teach mankind, and they shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God. A summary account of their travels, their preaching, their conversations, and their controversies, is contained in the history given of them in what is called the "Acts of the Apostles." This history embraces a period of about thirty years; and *here* if *any* where, in the records of the acts and proceedings of these first planters of the gospel, and propagators of the christian faith, we should expect to find the doctrine of future and endless punishment. They were anxious to convert sinners from the errour of their ways; to turn them from darkness to light; to save them from their sins, and bring them to the knowledge of the truth; and therefore would employ the best means to accomplish these important objects. Now if the doctrine of endless punishment be true, and was believed by them; if they considered it as important and salutary as many now think it to be, they would have taught it; they would have inculcated it with an energy and pathos at once, astonishing, and overwhelming. They would have exhibited future torment in all its terrours, and an endless hell in all the horrours, with which modern theology has invested it.

They preached to wicked and murderous Jews, the betrayers and murderers of the Son of God; to self-righteous scribes, pharisees and hypocrites, and to ungodly and idolatrous Ephesians and Atheians, and Gentile sinners of all descriptions. The substance of several of their sermons, exhortations, admonitions and counsels is recorded; but no account is given that *in a single instance* they warned their hearers of the danger of hell torments, or of punishment and misery in a future state. The word *gehenna*, translated hell, the only word claimed to designate a place of punishment in a future state, is not once found in all the Acts of the Apostles. How is this to be accounted for, except from the fact, either that the Apostles knew nothing, and believed nothing of a hell of fire and brimstone, in which mankind are to be punished in a future state, or else that they were unfaithful in their ministry, and betrayers of the souls of men. The latter will not be pretended. The Apostles were faithful, even unto death: they declared the whole truth, yet they never, that we have any account of, preached the doctrine of the endless wrath of God, or threatened their hearers with the damnation of gehenna.

I am surprised that more notice is not taken of this remarkable circumstance. What would be thought of a preacher now a days, who should preach for thirty years, without once mentioning hell as a place or state of future punishment, and without once apprising his hearers, that they were exposed to it? Would he be considered orthodox, and evangelical? Far from it. He would at least, be *suspected* of Universalism, if not denounced as an heretick; or at best, he would be looked upon as a dry, uninteresting, and inefficient preacher, incapable of getting up a revival, or of awakening and converting a single soul.

But mark, my brethren; the *Apostles* without the advantage of popular favour, and without attempting to frighten their hearers with the representation of a mighty devil, the fire of gehenna, and endless torture in a future state; only by preaching Jesus Christ, and

him crucified, and risen from the dead for the salvation of the world, according to God's eternal purpose ; The Apostles, I say, by this kind of preaching, had revivals, wherever they went ; revivals of light and gospel grace producing penitence and humility, gratitude and love, and universal benevolence and good will to men.

We have stated, and we presume it will not be contradicted, that the word hell, as denoting punishment and misery in a future state, or any other word which denotes it, is not once found in all the history of the preaching, and other acts of the Apostles : and *there* we should certainly have a right to expect to find it, if it were any part of gospel truth, or of the christian revelation. But it is said that our Saviour plainly asserts the doctrine of future and endless punishment in the text, when he says " these shall go away into everlasting punishment." The illustration of this passage, with a particular regard to the connection in which it is found, and with other passages also, referring to the same subject, claims a distinct and careful investigation, and will furnish sufficient matter for several discourses. My object in this has been, to offer some general observations upon the subject of future and endless punishment, and to show, upon the supposition that it is a doctrine of revelation, what we have a right to expect concerning it. As that it should be *plainly* revealed, in the scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament ; and that like other important doctrines, it should be often repeated and urgently inculcated. We noticed as an acknowledged fact, that the doctrine is no where taught in the Old Testament ; and glanced at the absurdity of supposing that the *gospel* should contain a revelation of wrath and terrour unknown before : and that if it does, why, in all the history of the teaching and preaching of the Apostles, no mention is made of the doctrine, no threatenings denounced, and no warnings given, which are predicated upon it. In all other cases, such circumstances and considerations would have great weight, and although they could not invalidate plain and positive testimony, they would lead to a careful enquiry, whether the evidence opposed to them is sufficiently positive and unambiguous, to overcome and set aside the strong presumption arising from them. Circumstances apparently so irreconcilable with the fact supposed to be substantiated by direct testimony, ought certainly to be allowed the same importance that is attached to them in all other cases. A few more general observations, relative to the doctrine under consideration, will finish the present discourse. It is said that the doctrine of endless punishment is plainly asserted by our Saviour particularly in the text. But if our Saviour taught it, the Apostles must have known it, and must also have taught and inculcated it themselves, if they were true to the trust imposed in them, and faithful in declaring the whole counsel of God. And if so, is it not wonderful that no mention is made of it ; no intimation of the doctrine in the whole history of their proceedings,—their teaching and preaching, their controversies, and the declarations of their faith ? Yet this is undeniably the case, and I think it sufficiently important to repeat it, that in the whole history of the Acts of the Apostles, comprehending a period of about thirty years, in which they preached to all sorts of people, Jews and Gentiles, there is no threatening or warning given of a hell of torments for any of the human race after death. Now, admitting the doctrine to be true, and that the Apostles believed it, how can their silence with respect to it be accounted for, or justified ? Suppose we had a correct history of the proceedings of the clergy of the State of Connecticut, for thirty years past : suppose it to contain an account of their preaching and their writings,—their conversations, controversies, creeds and confessions of faith ; would it think you, especially with regard to the doctrine of future punishment, resemble the history of the Acts of the Apostles ? Would it contain no account or information of a hell of misery in another world ? Should we not rather, on every page, meet a particular description of the endless torments of the damned ; of wretched beings, writhing in flames of liquid fire and brimstone, with the wrath of an angry God, beating down upon their defenceless heads, in one eternal storm of vengeance ; while saints in heaven, viewing the animating scene, rejoice in the endless triumph. A faithful history of the circumstances attending *modern revivals*, would be full of such exhibitions ; for it has long been found, that without the aid of the devil and hell, fallen angels and infernal regions, to frighten women and children, it is impossible to get up one of these revivals. To preach up God's universal and unchangeable love to mankind, would be sudden death to these pious ardours : for it really appears to be the opinion of many, that if God loves all his intelligent creatures, and will make none of them forever miserable, then it is of no consequence to worship and serve him, or to love him ; or to love and do good to one another.

It will still probably be urged that the scriptures do contain positive declarations of future punishment which cannot be rationally construed, so as to mean any thing short of endless misery. This is *not* admitted, and in a future discourse will be carefully considered. But suppose it *should be admitted*, that there are such declarations, and that they must be understood according to their literal and unqualified import. What would be the consequence? Positive declarations must be as good, and as authoritative in one case as in an other. Now I think it will be found, upon examination,

that there are not *more* apparently positive declarations, in favour of endless misery, than there are in support of the doctrine of Universal salvation. It is believed that a comparison would be greatly to the advantage of the latter in an appeal to the holy scriptures. It has been acknowledged that there is nothing to be found in the scripture of the Old Testament to prove either *endless*, or future misery; but they contain many positive declarations of universal salvation. Take a few instances out of many which might be cited. "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else; I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee *shall* bow, every tongue *shall* swear; [and] surely *shall* say, 'in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.'"—"The Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth *shall* see the salvation of our God."—Concerning the reign of the Messiah, the Lord says by the Psalmist, "I *shall* give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. The Lord *will* destroy the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations: he *will* swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God *will* wipe away tears from off all faces. Hence the Poet.

"No sigh, no murmur, the wide world shall hear,
From every face, he wipes off every tear,
In adamantine chains shall death be bound,
And hell's grim tyrant feel the eternal wound."

The New Testament is full of positive declarations of Universal Salvation. "His name shall be called Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins," that is all that he died to save, which is all mankind. "He came not to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." "I bring you good tidings of great joy, which *shall* be to *all* people, for unto you is born a Saviour." If I be lifted up from earth, I *will* draw *all* men unto me." The living God is the Saviour of all men,—he *will* have all men to be saved. The last enemy shall be destroyed, even death—every tongue *shall* confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Such, and a vast many more, are the positive declarations which go to establish the doctrine of universal grace, and the final salvation of all men. Now universal salvation is utterly inconsistent with endless punishment. If there are positive declarations on both sides of the question, which admit of no qualification, or reconciliation; then the scriptures, in their true meaning, contain positive contradictions. To admit this, would be to deny divine revelation. The scriptures, it is believed, are capable of a rational and consistent interpretation, in which their truth, their authority, and their excellence will be abundantly manifest; and in which it will appear as the Apostle says, that the things which were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience, and comfort of the scripture might have hope.

The principle objections which have been brought against the doctrine of Universal salvation, have been generally from those who have been unacquainted with it, or who have had very incorrect and superficial views of it. It seeks no concealment, it asks no apologies, it claims no implicit or blind adherence. It invites enquiry, and thorough, but sober and candid examination. If untrue and pernicious its friends are as desirous to know it, as its enemies are to point it out. To the law, therefore, and to the testimony; to enlightened reason, and to the scriptures consistently illustrated; if it speak not according to these, we acknowledge it is because there is no light in it. Great is truth, and it will prevail: may we search for it as for hid treasure; for knowing the truth it will make us free, it will make us joyful, it will bring health and peace to the mind.

THE ESSAYIST.

SERVICE TO GOD.—NO. 1.

No subject within the compass of our knowledge claims our attention more justly than religion. Placed as we are here, occupying the station we do, it is natural to enquire whence we came, and what is our final destination—what being gave us birth, and what allegiance we owe to him, what kind of service will be acceptable to him and profitable to us?

The first of these queries is easily answered. Whoever marks the various events; the dependencies of cause and effect observable in the whole of nature will readily admit the existence of some great Original, who gave birth to the whole and established the laws by which it is governed. Hence from him we took our existence, produced by the same Almighty fiat that called nature into being.

The second—our final destination is not so readily ascertained, on this point we have no positive evidence, the whole rests on revelation, and analogical reasoning. The effect may be inferred from a knowledge of the cause. When it is clearly ascertained that Jehovah is the cause of our being, a knowledge of his perfections will enable us to draw a rational conclusion what will be the result of our existence. Strengthening this conclusion by the assertions of inspiration our proof may amount to moral certainty. Admit God is a being of infinite goodness, I naturally infer all his acts must be like himself good. Hence if he confer existence upon any being that existence must, upon the whole, be a blessing to that being, or God would contradict the first principle of his nature by confering it. When to

this I add the numerous declarations of scripture representing God as desiring, willing, and taking measures to effect the ultimate happiness of all intelligent beings, I have no hesitancy in stating the conclusion, that whatever be the final destiny of man, it will upon the whole, be a happy one. Thence, the third query naturally presents itself; If God has made us, and destined us to a state of happiness, what allegiance do we owe him? what kind of worship will be acceptable to him, and profitable to us.

With regard to allegiance, we owe him the most unfeigned submission. We owe him ourselves and all we have, and all our powers of body and mind should unite to obey his commands and yield that service his law requires.

This service is the subject we shall now endeavour to ascertain. To this are all other enquiries subservient. A knowledge of our origin and end, the existence and perfections of the being who made us, have no other use than to determine our duty, to ascertain what must be done, and persuade us to its performance.

Having thus in my desultory manner come to my subject, I shall set myself regularly to work in discussing it.

This service I shall call *Religion* and shall include under the term, not only the actions we are to perform but also the principles necessary to their production.

I begin with the question, Why is religion necessary, or why are we under any obligation to perform any thing that may properly be called a service to God?

In answering the question, "Why is religion necessary, or why are we under obligations to serve God?" I notice a reason frequently assigned, that religion is necessary because in the original constitution of man God made it so, we are bound to serve him because he has commanded us.

The first is true as far as it goes, but it does not afford a full answer to the first member of the question. I grant religion is adapted to our nature, and a sense of this is incorporated in the constitution of every man. Accordingly, in all countries and in every age of the world, its propriety has been acknowledged. But religion is not the great end of our existence; God in adapting it to our natures, had an ulteriour object; this object we are at liberty to enquire.

Why then is religion necessary? we answer, because constituted as we are, it is conducive to our happiness. Happiness or the perception of pleasure, is the end proposed by Deity, and to this end should be directed, all the pursuits of the sentient creation. Religion is the means man must employ to gain this end. As far as it is productive of *this*, it is necessary and should be pursued, but no farther.

The answer to the second clause is true in effect, but not in principle. True in effect, because God can never consistently with his own perfections, command any thing but what is obligatory; and when we are sure a thing is commanded by God, we need enquire no farther, but should yield it obedience. Still we think there is a prior law, or at least we are not bound to obey, *merely* because the thing is commanded. The command is nothing more than an exposition of an exising obligation; it gives no new sanctions; it merely explains and brings home to our minds, what was eternally established in the nature of things.

Should it here be alleged that "God is our sovereign; a sovereign has a right to command; and the right to command pre-supposes our obligation to obey," we answer by asking, why has a sovereign the right to command? Surely not because he has the *power* to enforce his commands; for then, every act of tyranny and injustice might be justified. Among men a sovereign may have this right; because by original contract or tacit consent, he is invested with authority which he holds as a publick trust, and which he is bound to use for the general good. The obedience of the subject is a duty, because where such authority is properly exercised, the performance of his duty becomes a source of happiness to himself. But there is a point beyond which the sovereign loses his right to command, and the subject is absolved from his obligation to obey. When the command is in opposition to the general good, it is nugatory; and if the example of disobedience will not introduce a greater evil, the subject is justified in bidding it defiance. The inference is therefore evident—the right of the sovereign to command, does not consist in his being clothed with power or authority; nor the obligation of the subject, in his being commanded, but both rest in the fitness of things. There is a law to which both kings and subjects are accountable, the law of eternal justice or eternal rectitude. This law is anteriour to all other laws, and that which gives all just laws their force and nullifies every unjust one. It is the law of nature, and as the philosophick emperour well observes, "binds both Gods and men." Jehovah is bound by this law, as much as the smallest creature he has made. If it be thought this approximates the *fatum* of the Stoicks, we answer, nothing more is meant than that Jehovah is as much bound to do *right*, as any one of his creatures. Nothing more is expressed than the apostle would convey, when he said, "It is impossible for God to lie."

But why are we bound to obey this law of rectitude? Because our own good requires such obedience. Hence the reason why we are under obligations to serve God, is because in the original constitution of things, *such service is conducive to our happiness.* Should God (admitting it were possible) command a service, that is, on the whole, productive of our misery, and no good to result from it, we are

under no obligations to perform it. But by the law of his own nature, by the law of his unbounded goodness, (which are only different ways of expressing the same thing,) Deity is bound to seek the good of his sentient creation. Whatever he commands must be directed to this end; and *because* it is directed to this end, and is calculated to effect it, we are bound to obey.

Here it will be perceived that the answer to both members of the question, is the same; religion is necessary to our happiness. We are bound to serve God because such service is necessary for the production of our happiness. But what if men are willing to forego their own happiness? let them take the consequences which follow. I know no law to compel a man to be happy against his will. But this is mere gratuitous. Every man *wills* to be happy, and when not turned aside by accidental causes, always pursues the path he believes most likely to reach it,

Every being must will to be happy, and when Christ told the Jews, "Ye *will* not come to me that ye might have life," (or happiness) it was not because they did not *will* to be happy, but because they did not believe coming to him would make them happy. In this they misjudged. Convince them of their mistake, and they will correct it.

We do not mean to inculcate selfishness when we assign the production of our own happiness, as the reason why we are bound to serve God. It is the duty of every being to diffuse happiness to the full extent of his abilities. But all percipient beings are so united here, that what in reality produces the greatest sum of individual good, will produce the greatest sum of general good. The whole is made up of parts, and the greatest happiness of all the parts, will be the greatest happiness of the whole. In this sense "self-love and social are the same."

The reason why serving God is productive of our happiness, will be developed while enquiring what service we are bound to render our Almighty Sovereign. This shall be the subject of my next.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

REVIEW OF AMICUS.

I insert in this number another communication from Amicus, and as he has not given notice of an intended continuation, it cannot be deemed improper to present a brief review. Amicus has said some very good things; much he has said he might have learned from my own writings, and, though not wholly, yet very nearly expressed in the same terms.

I agree with him in most of the abstract principles he stated in his first commuication, though some of them are shaded in a manner, I think, calculated to produce wrong impressions. In stating the manner in which we acquire our knowledge he is correct. In speaking of the "seductive wiles" of falsehood, he has attributed more art, as well as more beauty, to that hagard wretch, than I believe her to possess. Truth in my opinion, is by far the lovelier of the two, and I believe there is scarcely a fool living but would choose truth rather than falsehood, were he to see them both.

As it respects our fallibility and the shortness of our life, what Amicus advances may be true, but does not deserve the importance he seems to believe. Man is capable of perceiving truth, and of distinguishing it from falsehood. Not indeed all truth, I will admit; and hence the first step we should take, is to learn where the line, which divides things we can know from things we cannot, should be drawn. The one class of things we may study without much danger of error; of the other, all we can learn, with the powers we now possess, will be conjecture.

Much is said about the "fallibility of our nature," and the little dependence to be placed upon the deductions of human reason. This is the mere cant of the priest. If no dependence is to be placed on our own ability, to determine what is true, how shall we be assured the Bible is not a cheat; if we are never to trust our own powers, how are we to know that what the priest tells is not false? The case is, this argument is often alledged as a reason why we should not dispute the assertions of our religionists, but it is in reality an equally strong argumeut why we should not believe them. If a man tells me I ought not to disbelieve a thing because I am a fallible being, and because I may be deceived, I reply I ought then not to believe. I am a fallible being, I may believe what is not true.

His remarks on the shortness of life are doubtless true; but if he intends to enforce the argument he has suggested, he will perpetuate all the ignorance and all the miseries under which we groan. Happily however for the world people are beginning to treat such arguments as they deserve. If the farmer should reason as Amicus would have me reason, he would say each spring, "I will not plough my ground, nor scatter any seed into the earth, for I may die before it will ripen." Amicus would tell us, what every body knows, that if in our enquiries after knowledge, "we begin back in embryo, we may die before we can grasp the whole of knowledge." Very true. But what shall we do? take every thing as we find it and make no exertions? By no means. Learn what we can, and leave our successors to perfect our enquiries. But Amicus says if he draws from "nature alone"—Now if he can point out any other sources of knowledge, than *nature*, he will confer on me a favour, which I fear, I shall never have the pleasure of acknowledging. Perhaps he will think the uncertainty of life is so great that it will be best not to attempt it.

I think I do not misunderstand his argument. He doubtless considers, we must take the experience of our predecessors and also the Bible. I admit both, for both are indeed the same. The bible is the experience of individuals who lived in former days, and is to us a historick record, supported as are all oth-

er historick records. With regard to what has been transmitted us from other times, we are to ascertain what is true, or we are to ascertain what others have established as truth, and this must form so much of our stock of knowledge, we may then be said to be so far in advance. But as every man, who knows any thing must know antiquity, as well as our immediate predecessors, have transmitted us errour, as well as truth. To adopt, as the foundation of the temple we would raise, what has thus been furnished us, without discriminating the durable from the perishable materials, would be building upon a mixed foundation, liable at every moment to give way and destroy, or render useless all our labours. We must begin back, and though the labour of others will lessen and facilitate our own we must still traverse the whole ground, find the true path of enquiry, walk it far as we can, and leave to those who come after us to progress farther.

What he alledges respecting the possibility of my having sometimes mistaken falsehood for the truth, is very possible.

That I should err, is nothing unaccountable, and Amicus need not have laboured so hard to make me think it very probable. I, like the rest of my species, am liable to err, and also, as I believe all are, capable of ascertaining some things for a certainty. What Amicus alledges as a reason why I have erred, is unworthy his own sagacity and the freedom of enquiry which even he would allow.

He thinks it strange that all who lived before me have been mistaken, that all the wise, the pious, the acute and the reverend, should have discovered no truth, and that the editor of the Gospel Advocate alone should be the happy man, to be blessed with the possession of truth. Now I am strongly inclined to reply to such reasoning, fudge! What does it amount to? I remark on this, I have never insinuated that all who lived before me have been entirely wrong. Most of the sentiments I have advanced, if not all of them, have been advanced for ages. I have availed myself of what others have written, and I believe I hold some sentiments which all denominations of whatever name or character also hold; I have aimed to discover those sentiments in which all mankind either do or must agree, as soon as they have examined them.

I treat either as false or unnecessary, most of those notions which divide mankind. For I have discovered that all things which are susceptible of demonstration, require only to be perceived by the mind, together with the evidence by which they are supported, to have all agree to their truth. Who doubts a theorem in mathematicks when he understands it? Who that has seen the Sun doubts its circular form? Now to avoid contention, experience has discovered this grand truth, *we are to contend for nothing which is not susceptible of proof or of being established by evidence.*

I have also remarked, those things about which mankind differ, are destitute of sufficient, or what is the same thing, of evidence enough within our reach to establish them. And still farther, these things which rest upon doubtful authority, are of no great consequence to the peace and welfare of mankind here, however valuable they may be to us hereafter. Now I am not the first who has made this discovery. My own observations have convinced me it is true. I have therefore stepped forth for the purpose, not of convincing others, but, to induce them to mark their own experience, and to convince themselves, or to ascertain the correctness of my position from *their* observations. This may be "presumption"—it may be "audacity," but the same might be said of every one who has come forward as a reformer. It might have been alledged of Luther, it might have been alledged of Jesus, it might have been alledged of Moses, and it may be alledged of any one who shall at some future day come forward to expunge the errours which the sagacity of the present day may overlook; and very likely 30,000 years hence some philosopher like myself, may be found pleading for reform and another like Amicus may accuse him of presumption, of audacity &c. But what of all this? Shall we be discouraged from doing what we can, or ridiculed for proclaiming what of truth we are confident we have discovered? Such things deter not me.

Amicus says I have proscribed the doctrine of "imputed righteousness." I am not aware of having written any thing against it; I may, but I do not recollect—I however do not believe the doctrine. To me it is one of the most absurd, as well as the most deleterious sentiments that ever priest-craft taught, or ignorance believed. To me it is a libel on common sense, a "caricature" of Christianity, and an affront to all sound morality. In the sermon to which Amicus alludes there is not a single word said about "imputed righteousness," and the seeming contradiction with which he has made himself so merry, is easily reconciled by any mind sufficiently capacious to reconcile two facts, one growing out of the abuse of a theory, and the other out of its right use.

The two facts, which appeared incomprehensible to Amicus, stated in the sermon, are, first, the notion that men are virtuous because they adopt a certain creed, or that they must be orthodox to be accounted holy, has been the cause of incalculable misery to the world—let the history of the church determine whether this assertion be correct or not. The other fact is, that a rational belief in the doctrine of Christ, is favourable to virtue—let the christian answer, whether this be correct or not. What all this has to do with imputed righteousness, I know not. Amicus has undertaken to prove the doctrine, but he has so explained it that no theologian who prays to be saved "for Christ's sake" will own it.

If am able to understand his reasoning, he does not mean that faith is justification, but that as a righteous being, God could not justify us for our works, he must, therefore, keep us eternally condemned, unless he can find a substitute for good works. That is to say God could not pronounce the sinner just *de facto*, nor by any existing law, so he introduces faith *post facto*, and declares that he who will believe shall be accounted just or righteous, notwithstanding so far as the fact is concerned, he is unjust, still a sinner.

I know not by what rules the court of heaven is

governed, but I believe every wise man would despise an earthly court, guilty of such trifling, not to use a harsher term.

I believe no such doctrine. I do not believe Deity allows of any fictions of law. Earthly courts indeed do. The English government declares the "King cannot do wrong," though he may be the biggest scoundrel that was ever ranked as one of the biped race. Amicus would make the court of heaven do the same.—Here is a murderer. God cannot at once pronounce him a good man; that would be false, but God can say to him "murderer, believe I died on the cross in Judea, and that you will be damned to all eternity if you don't believe it, and I will pronounce you a just man." I dislike such trifling. God will pronounce no man just until he is just, and he will receive none until he is personally holy, "for without holiness shall no man see the Lord."

The true doctrine, I believe is this, Christ's life, preaching, suffering, death and resurrection, are calculated, when believed, to produce righteousness in us; and when we become personally righteous, then, and not till then, we are *ipso facto*, justified. There are no fictions, no accounting things which are not, as though they were, except as God's superintendance of all things, and his prescience enable him to predict the thing when it has not actually transpired, and he knowing that all men through the influence of the means adopted, will become just, he may sometimes pronounce him so, when such is not the fact. But every thing of this kind is spoken in reference to the end which God knows to be certain, and not in reference to what at the particular point of time, may be the actual character of the individual.

The passages of scripture, quoted by Amicus from the writings of Paul, may easily be reconciled to what I have stated by bearing in mind, that Paul often become "all things to all men that he might gain some." That is, Paul always, in his reasoning, regards only the particular point which he is, at any particular time, endeavoring to prove. The extracts from his writings, introduced by Amicus, have relation, not to what we call good works, but to the works enjoined by the Jewish ceremonial law. The letters were addressed to Judaizing Christians, who contended that believers in Christ should observe the Jewish rites and ceremonies. Paul reproves them; and declares "Christ is the end of the law to every one that believeth." End of what law? end of the law of good works? of the law which enjoins personal holiness? no. But of the law which enjoined the offering of a lamb, or a he goat, as an atonement for sin. Paul contends that the "hand writing of ordinances is blotted out," and that we are to walk in "newness of life, after the spirit and not after the flesh." That is, the various things which the law of Moses enjoined, which could not make the comers thereunto perfect, are no longer to be insisted on, as to be true followers of Christ, we are to "walk after the spirit," Or in the language of Christ "be ye therefore perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect," or in the words of John "he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous," and "know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him."

Now all this is perfectly plain. Understand Paul as speaking of the works of the Jewish law, which works were only a "show of good things and of will worship," bear in mind that these works were discarded by the gospel, as unable to atone for sin, as the Jews believed, and that instead of performing these we must have faith in Christ, or fidelity in his doctrine, that is, faithfulness in the practice of moral goodness, and Amicus' doctrine of "imputed righteousness" "falls over the precipice of forgetfulness."

It is true, the scriptures say that a man "is justified by faith" but this does not mean that a man is justified *for* believing, but the man is justified *in* believing. That is, faith works by love and purifies the heart. Faith becomes the moving cause of our justification, not because it possesses any merit of itself, but inasmuch as it is a means and some say the only means, of producing moral goodness. So Christ is said to be "our righteousness;" but this is to be understood only as Christ's righteousness has the effect to produce righteousness in us.

It is not necessary to dwell longer on this. The remarks I have made exhibit the only rational ground on which the apparently conflicting passages of scripture can be reconciled. If Amicus complains that I have not noticed every passage he has quoted, I will answer him, the general remarks made will serve to explain them. I have given the rule, let Amicus and my readers generally test its correctness and applicability. The language of James who is as good authority as Paul or any of the twelve—will best express my feelings on this subject. "What doth it profit, my brethren, for a man to say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, "depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith if it have not works, is dead being alone. Thou hast faith and I have works: show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works. Thou believest there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man! that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works, when he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." (See James ii. 14—24 inclusive.)

Now if the language of James means any thing and to me it is certainly very full of meaning, and withal perfectly intelligible, and as authoritative as any part of the bible—I say if the language of James means any thing it must mean, that faith of itself is of no use like the body when its spirit has fled, that faith is useful only as it prompts good works, and that instead of a man's being justified because he has faith right or wrong as Amicus would insinuate, none can be justified until they have good works or are personally holy.

I have now replied to all that I consider worthy of notice in these articles, I have given my views on the subject, suggested by the remarks of Amicus, I have given some of the reasons why I adopt them. Amicus has given the reasons for his—all is now before our readers, who must determine for themselves. I shall cheerfully insert whatever communications Amicus may choose to favour me with, if written in a style and with ability equal to those I have noticed. My columns are open to all well written articles, coming from whatever sect they may, from orthodox or heterodox, believer, or sceptick. The only restriction is, they must be compressed within due bounds, and couched in temperate language, and breathe that tone of dignity and good feeling which every man of sense must wish to cultivate.—EDITOR.

FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

One of the most difficult parts of Universalism, for its opponents, and perhaps for its advocates, to understand, is the forgiveness of sins, viewed in connexion with the notion that every one shall be punished to the full amount of his deserts. It is not necessary to notice all the mistakes on this subject, perhaps my brethren will *forgive* me if I assert that Universalists have not been remarkably explicit in stating their own views.

The doctrine of punishment is little understood. I have already given my views of it, and pointed out what I deem exceptionable in the views embraced by others. But if it be admitted that every one shall be punished for their sins to the full amount, it must, I think, also be admitted that there can be no such a thing as forgiveness. Forgiveness, if it means any thing, means the remitting or passing by something which might have been exacted.—When applied to a criminal it commonly means the dispensing with some or all of the punishment he had been condemned to suffer. But if one suffers all to which he is sentenced, what is he forgiven?

Now, were I to understand the term forgiveness, and punishment, according to their ordinary import, I should determine against the Universalist; and it seems no difficult matter to excuse the Orthodox for accusing us of inconsistency. Still the things for which Universalists contend are facts. The only difficulty is they are not always clearly presented and sometimes wrongly named. Now I find in my religious theory, no place for the term punishment. Both the Orthodox and my own denomination, would call me heretick for this, yet I do not essentially differ from any intelligent Universalist, with whom I am acquainted. The term, punishment, always conveys to my mind, something of retaliation, something bordering on revenge. But when the character of God is considered, the idea of revenge seems inadmissible. It cannot present us a very dignified view of Jehovah, to say he exerts his omnipotence to revenge himself of such weak, puny creatures as we are, when compared with him.

If it be said God punishes to reform, I would strike out the term *punish* and say God allows his creatures to suffer temporary pain for their permanent advantage. This, I believe, is the idea, when clearly stated, which nearly all Universalists admit. On this view what is punishment according to *desert*? We are misled, or liable to be misled, because we adopt terms which have been appropriated to other ideas. But to answer the question according to the explication of the terms which every consistant Universalist must give, we must say the punishment *deserved* is just the quantity which will reform the offender or prove beneficial to the one who endures it. This, it may easily be perceived, has nothing to do with the guilt or innocence of the sufferer, but as to the rationale of the pain, every one may be accounted innocent, for the enquiry is not, what the man has done, but how much pain will do him good.

On this view of punishment, and if I am not greatly deceived, it is the view which all Universalists take, it is easy to be perceived what is forgiveness. I beg pardon of my brethren, when they say forgiveness is that which makes the sinner virtuous, for this would confound punishment and forgiveness, and make both mean the same thing. Punishment is that which reforms the sinner, or at least is one means of doing it; forgiveness is that which, when the sinner is reformed, wipes out the recollection of his former evil deeds, and receives him to the same favour he would have received, had he never sinned. God forgives us our sins, he blots out our transgressions, wipes out the memery of our evil deeds, and receives us as his children. Punishment serves to reform the offenders, forgivenes is an act of oblivion, by which offences are forgotten. Hence we see every man may be punished all that he *deserves*, and still need forgiveness. Both may be together in the same individual.

HORRID IMPIETY.

Who has ever visited the lovely village of Auburn and not noticed the Outlet of the Owasco Lake, a fine and useful stream of water, which runs through the midst of the village? There are few more valuable streams of water than this Outlet. It drives a large share of machinery and serves to enrich many and industrious—and, perhaps not very industrious—citizen. It is for some considerable distance lined with mills, factories and various hydraulick establishments. And, what should be accounted a real advantage, it winds along but a few rods from the Presbyterian Church, so near that it may be considered almost under the droppings of the sanctuary and blessed with the pious instructions of our good

Presbyterian Pastor—whose zeal for holy things is almost proverbial.

Thus situated, who would expect to find the said Owasco Outlet, weekly disobeying, setting at defiance the laws of God and man? Yet so it is. The stream, it is said, is a confirmed Sabbath-breaker! Though sermon after sermon has been preached close by its banks, though prayer after prayer has been delivered there for the sanctification of the Sabbath, though Senator Johnson has been castigated for his Report, though the Synod which organized the Pioneer line of stages held its session hard by, yet it continues to profane that holy day of rest on which God himself rested, by rolling the mass of waters collected in the Owasco Lake to the Seneca River whence it after winding about for some thousands of miles finds its way into the ocean.

Would it not be well to call a publick meeting to enquire if this daring impiety cannot be stopped?

OUTRAGE.

William Andrews, Editor of the Free Meetings Advocate, is now confined in the jail of this county, for attempting to enlighten the Presbyterians of this village. Mr. Andrews is one of the most honest and industrious of our citizens. He believes religious meetings should be free and that every decent man has a right to express in them his honest convictions. He felt it his duty to say a few words to the Presbyterian congregation, assembled on a late Sabbath for worship. He believed he had the right to do it. He attended, asked for the liberty to address the congregation, made some attempts to address them but was rudely thrust out of the house; and on Monday morning was tried before a justice of the peace, for *disturbing* the meeting, sentenced to pay $25,00 fine, or to thirty days imprisonment. He chose the imprisonment.

For ourself we are confident there is no law in this state, which the court can adduce to justify the sentence. We are well aware of the statute alledged, but do not believe that by any fair construction it can be made to reach the case of William Andrews. That law contemplates an entirely different kind of disturbance, at least, it contemplates rude, indecent behaviour, or wilful and malicious disturbance, neither of which can be alledged against Mr. Andrews. We believe it an unfeeling outrage upon the liberty of speech in a good cause, (for it was of religion he proposed to speak) and a disgrace to the individuals and to the society which are guilty of it. Of one thing we are certain, if our interpretation of the law be incorrect, the Presbyterians in this place have made themselves despised by every liberal minded man. Confident they are right, believing all heaven, earth and even hell itself, are on their side, they must come forth in vindictive rage against an honest virtuous man, shut him up in prison merely because he wanted to say a few words in their meeting. Is this the spirit of Christ? Presbyterians of Auburn! where is your shame?

We have received the third number (the first and second have not been sent,) of the Christian Watchman and Repository, a new series of the Christian Repository formerly edited by Samuel C. Loveland.

The present series will be issued weekly on a half sheet, quarto form, edited and published by William Bell, at Woodstock, Vt.

The Repository is one of the oldest of our periodicals, and was when edited by Mr. L. one of the ablest and to us most interesting. Mr. Loveland is not surpassed by any man in our connexion for his candour, judgement, and industry. His literary, biblical and critical acquisitions are such as do honour to the man, and will we hope some day be fully appreciated by our denomination. We take pleasure in paying a tribute to his worth. We have shared his instructions, and though we may not agree with him in all his sentiments, we shall ever be anxious to retain his friendship.

Of Mr. Bell we cannot speak, for we know nothing. The appearance of his paper is respectable, and the number before us is interesting. We look to Vermont with peculiar interest. It is our native state. And this paper is published in the vicinity of all our earlier associations. We rejoice at the prosperity of liberal sentiments in that state. We think the bold independent spirit which characterized the Green mountain Boys in their early history, will show itself no less conspicuous in the maintenance of mental independence. We think it doubtful whether there be another state in the union, in which liberal sentiments have a larger proportion of its inhabitants for their advocates.

Though unwelcomed ourself and unnoticed except by a solitary voice, we welcome brother Bell to the family of liberal editors and wish him all the success his talents and independent spirit, and the good cause he has espoused may deserve.

LIBERAL EXTRACTS.

This is a monthly periodical on a half sheet, 8vo. published at Woodstock, Vt. It is perhaps customary to ask on announcing a new paper, What is its creed? We somewhat doubt whether this paper has as yet adopted one. If it has it keeps it to itself, for we have not been able to discover it. It is however opposed to priest-craft, and we think it may not be useless in arousing a spirit of enquiry. Its terms are fifty cents a year.

We have received a sermon on the Rich man and Lazarus, by Thomas Whittemore, of Cam-

bridgeport. It is a fair exposition of the Parable and does honour to its anthour. We have not room to present our readers with a review of it, but shall like if Br. Whittemore has no objections to publish it in our columns.

I notice, in the third number of the Christian Watchman and Repository, an article attempting to reconcile the foreknowledge of God with the free agency of man. When will men learn enough to let such folly alone? Men may, as men have, exhaust the brightest genius and the most profound erudition on this subject and retire from the field without having discovered a single fact which can be of use to us in life, except what belongs to God is hidden from mortals like us. Let these metaphysical folks who would ransack heaven and penetrate the depths of the Divinity, recollect the saying of the wisest of the Greeks, "*gnothi seauton*"—"Know thyself." We cannot scan Jehovah, we cannot learn the counsels of heaven, nor tell what influence invisible beings exert over us.

The times require our talents to be applied to what may turn to some account. It is of no kind of use to know what is done in the moon. Man is capable of action. Let him learn what he ought to do to make himself and his brethren happy, and *do* it if he can. I do not believe there is any God that will prevent him, or any foreknowledge of God that will compel him to be idle or vicious.

"DER FROLICHE BOTSCHAFTER."

This is a *German* paper published in Marietta, Lancaster co. Pa. It advocates the doctrine of God's impartial benevolence, and the final salvation of the human family. It is conducted by Geo. Grosh and Jacob Myers, men, if we may judge from some specimens of their talent, which we have seen, who will give it a high rank in the increasing family of liberal publications. The appearance of this "Messenger of glad tidings" is neat, and we doubt not it will prove an angel of joyful intelligence to many who have been brooding over the endless wretchedness of a part of their brethren, and who have long shrunk back with horrour, from the sad catastrophe which orthodoxy in her malice proposes. May God in his Providence guide the work and make it highly instrumental in dispelling the clouds from our moral heavens, and in sending forth the Sun of Righteousness in his glory, light, life and invigorating influence.

This notice should have appeared in our last but was mislaid till too late for insertion. The editors are welcome to their task, and will receive the prayers of all the liberal minded, for their prosperity.—Ed.

The Essay on Service to God was originally published in the Utica Magazine, over the signature of Philanthropos. As nobody, who has seen the Magazine, can doubt its orthodoxy, or the orthodoxy of the Christian Intelligencer, which copied it, I republish the essay. Some who retain the spirit of exclusive orthodoxy though calling themselves universalists, may see how far my sentiments have changed in two years. These editors approved of the articles, and certainly they are as infidel as any I have ever written.

The sermon I present my readers in this number, is the first of the four which I, some weeks since promised to lay before them.—These sermons are from the Rev. Menzies Rayner. They were originally preached in Hartford Conn. and published in the Religious Inquirer, a paper I have heretofore noticed.

I do not copy these sermons because I am too indolent to furnish original ones. They will, doubtless be more pleasing to my readers than any thing I might offer from my own pen. By publishing these I can also gratify my feelings to their authour, by introducing him to my readers; and I can thus reciprocate some of the good will which he has shown to me.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Editor—

In opposing any sentiments of theology, especially those which have long been maintained by the Christian church, it is peculiarly requisite that we should not only examine the propriety of such sentiments, but that we should search the *Scriptures* and ascertain whether such doctrines are taught therein, (for if we believe their sayings, then there is some evidence to be given to their testimony, lest peradventure we may deceive ourselves and swerve from the truth. Those prominent doctrines which you aver to be anti-christian, which you anathematize and vilify, which you allege as attended with such deleterious consequences, are doctrines that have been long embraced by the votaries of the cross of Christ; and therefore, before we should have the boldness, the audacity to reject them, we should inspect them closely and minutely, lest we should reject the truth and believe a lie, that we may be damned. I would not contend that in consideration of the antiquity of these principles or sentiments they are entitled to our acceptance; for inasmuch as truth and knowledge are progressive, it is possible that our progenitors may have never gained access to their counsels: neither would I assume the position that we are under obligations to receive their sentiments as valid, because they are transmitted to us through such respectable mediums Nor will I *willingly* allow an individual to reject them, because he considers himself living in an age more enlightened than those which have preceded it; for it is an in-

controvertible fact that truth has been paitrally elicited in the present period,

Sir, as these doctrines have been supported by the wise, the learned, the critical, and the profound for many centuries, should we not be extremely cautious in our investigations, lest we should brand the truth with heresy, and prescribe it as *Heterodox*? It seems to be a little curious that the learned connoisseur, who so carefully examines the doctrines of the Scriptures, should be so mistaken in regard to their import But *enough;* the question is, have they ascertained the truth, or have they left posterity to accomplish that which defied their power and skill, or in other words, are those prominent features of the Christian religion, which you defame, the true features, or are they a mere *caricature* I have noticed (I previously observed) that among other *doctrines* you have denounced as anti-christian, is the doctrine of imputed righteousness. As a specimen of your paradoxical animadversions, see *Sermon* on Faith, *Gosp. Adv. Vol. 7, No. 3* There with the fine spun threads of rhetorical eloquence you have harangued your readers upon the pernicious nature and licentious tendency, the fatal effects and deleterious consequences of such a sentiment, you have endeavoured to arouse, by declamation, their abhorrence and indignation of a sentiment, fraught with such direful effects and destructive evils But how you can maintain that faith, accompanied with the imputation of righteousness, has kindled the most aggravating fires of misery, drenched the earth with human gore, fanned the flame of persecution, and consumed the charity and friendship existing among mankind, and in the mean time affirm that faith is conducive of virtue, and a powerful stimulant to righteousness. How you can declare that this doctrine has degenerated mankind into the lowest state of moral degradation, dispossessed him of every principle of genuine goodness, retarded the progress of knowledge, torn society asunder, severed the ligaments of brotherly love, and rendered mankind more like the ferocious tiger or the prowling panther, than him whose image he bears; and at the same time allege that faith makes men holy and happy, that it calls into exercise all the best feelings of our nature, and prepares for us the highest state of enjoyment of which we are susceptible, is to me incomprehensible

If it be just to give every man his due, and it be a fact that faith hath a tendency to reform the unbeliever and make him more holy, it certainly cannot be improper or unjust to impute to him as much righteousness as hath been derived from the faith he has embraced, even for that faith should an individual receive a promise of a reward for obsequious righteousness, and this reward be a sufficient inducement to engage his attention, or a sufficient incentive to virtue and obedience; no sooner would he be persuaded that the promised recompense would be granted, than he would comply with the stipulations of the condition; and, therefore, we should have the undoubted right to impute righteousness to him for his faith, in consequence of its effects, for it has produced righteousness as its fault. Now if faith in the Lord Jesus Christ be a powerful stimulant to virtue, then he, who becomes an accipient of this faith, may have righteousness imputed unto him, in proportion to the influence this faith has upon his conduct or morals. Although these cases may not be exactly parallel with that sentiment you are endeavouring to abrogate, yet I think they are a species of that doctrine, and so far must receive the acknowledgement of all. All theological subjects must receive their support or condemnation from the Scriptures, and no other evidence, save the testimony of holy writ, is sufficient to warrant our falminations or anathemas. To the law and to the testimony then let us appeal. Let our difference of opinion be decided by this word. Do ye allege that man must become righteous by living in obedience to the requirements of the divine law in order to have righteousness attributed to him? What saith the *oracles?*—Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness. For what was righteousness counted? for works? Nay—for belief or faith. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. Blessed are they whose sins are forgiven, and whose iniquities are covered. How will ye evade these unequivocal declarations of divine truth? Will ye say that because "the Old Testament is superceded by the New it is not the word of inspiration," and may not therefore be true? Will ye say that because the people in the present century have acquired a more extensive knowledge of the fine arts, and have made more improvements in science, mechanism, manufactures, agriculture and civilization, than some preceding one, will ye affirm that they were entirely ignorant of these things? Suffice it to be so, and let me allow you all the lenity you can ask, considering as the word of inspiration only the doctrinal part of the New Testament Scriptures, and what will be the result? The faith of Abraham was imputed to him for righteousness; nor was it written for him alone, but for *us* also, to whom it shall be imputed if we believe on him that raised up Jesus from the dead.—Rom. iv. 22, 24.

Here you perceive that righteousness was counted to Abraham, not for a rectitude of conduct or good works, but for faith; and not only so, but that it shall be imputed to us also, if we believe in him that raised up Jesus from the dead. Now this testimony is sufficient of itself to satisfy the unbiased. But supposing the prejudiced may require two or three wit-

nesses, I proceed Now I count all things as dross that I may be found in Christ, not having my own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God, by faith.—Phil. iii. 9. Here we discover that Saul expected that as righteousness was imputed to Abraham for faith, so in like manner it would be attributed to him, that he might be justified in the sight of God, knowing that by the law no flesh could be justified. Hence, we conclude, blessed is the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.—*Paul to the Romans*

From the above testimony, which you will not abrogate, we learn that righteousness is not imputed for our obedience to the mandates of heaven, nor for our piety, morality, godliness, benevolence and charity, but, on the contrary, for faith. Now if it were by complying with all the stipulations of the law that we receive the imputation of righteousness, then it would come by the law, faith would become void, and the promise of none effect.—See *Romans* iv. 14. For if we fulfil the law, then we shall live thereby. The law requires perfect obedience to its injunctions: so far then from our being justified by the deeds of law, all flesh becomes guilty before God. Now justification signifies the pronouncing a person righteous according to law. All have received the condemnation of the law, rather than the justification, as having violated its rules. How then are they to be acquitted? By holiness of life, obsequious righteousness, and good works? *Nay*—for in all these they have come short of perfection. How then can they be justified? God judgeth righteously, and therefore without righteousness they cannot be justified; for in that case the judgment would not be according to truth. It is obvious that in order to be acquitted, we must appear guiltless of every accusation, every charge.—We know we have disobeyed the commands of heaven How then, I ask, *how* can we be justified by him who judgeth righteously? Not by works which we have done, but by the righteousness which is of God, through faith. In order to be justified by the law, or by heaven, we must appear holy: yea, our righteousness must be adequate to the demands of the law under which we are situated. Now as we know we have broken the commandments, to whom shall we fly for succour, for relief, for refuge. *Answer.*—To him who fulfilled the law for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, by whose stripes we are healed—unto him, by whose righteousness the free gift came upon all men unto the justification of life—unto him by whose obedience many were made righteous. Now we perceive from this scheme, the which is scriptural, that the covenant of grace is in opposition to the law of works, and that *justification* comes not by law, but by faith which is imputed to us for righteousness.

I would not argue that faith is our righteousness, or that righteousness is imputed only in proportion to our faith, for in so doing I should fall into the same errour as that against which I am contending. We know our faith may be imperfect, perhaps infected with many errours, and hence if our faith be all the righteousness of which we can boast, or if righteousness be attributed to us in proportion to the perfection of our faith, we should be found wanting, and consequently could not be acquitted in the sight of a perfect law. I therefore argue, that inasmuch as Christ fulfilled the law for us; as by him our sins are borne away; as we are made the righteousness of God in him; as by his righteousness the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life; as righteousness is counted for faith; as we cannot be justified for our own works; as our faith may be imperfect, so the perfect righteousness of Christ is attributed unto us for our faith, which presents us blameless before God, according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world. For by him, all that believe are justified from all things which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.—*Acts* xiii. 39.

From the above selections of Scripture from the many that might be adduced, I am persuaded that this doctrine is a doctrine of the bible, and one of the pillars that supports the fabrick of redeeming love and reconciling grace. And I am farther persuaded that if the sentiment can be made to appear erroneous, the whole repository of *truth* may be metamorphosed into a book of riddles and fables, while feeble man will be driven on the tempestuous sea of time, without a compass to direct, a pilot to dictate, or a helm to govern—subject to the disasters of storms, tempests and hurricanes, and liable to be hurled into the vortex of irrecoverable ruin. AMICUS.

TO JAMES LUCKEY.—NO. 2.

Dear sir—your reply to mine of April 18th, has been duly received, and I beg you will accept the assurance of the high estimation I have of that disposition, which can rise superior to petty religious prejudices, and retain the man and the friend, even while contending for different theological notions.

I approve the candour of your communication but, while I cheerfully reciprocate its friendly spirit, I must tell you I think it far from meeting the nature of the argument, far from proving my conclusions wrong, or yours correct. The three positions you have assumed, if supported, might sustain your notions of the final destination of man, but these positions must be *proved* or they avail nothing.

The first which retates to the existence of evil was fully considered in my other letter and

I can find nothing in yours which has the least tendency to invalidate what I have stated. I admitted evil did exist, but concluded it must cease to exist, or the goodness or power of God must be given up. Now I consider this a proposition that no man of common sense can doubt, unless he believes that the eternal existence of misery is a benefit.

How, sir, will you prove to me any being is good? By declaring he is good, and then if his conduct is destructive, declare that destruction is good because the being who is the author of it is good? Sir, you cannot but perceive the fallacy of such reasoning, and yet you reason in the same manner. You tell me God is good. I bring the evil which exists in the world, as an objection to his goodness. I tell you goodness is an definite term, it has a distinct meaning, that it is opposed to evil and that the being who does evil is not good. You say the evil which exists is no objection to his goodness because he is good. How do you prove this? If I should break your head, how correct would be the argument," the man who broke your head Mr. Luckey, is not a bad man because he has done so serious an injury, for he is a good man?"

Now Sir, you know there is evil in the world, you know that misery preys upon all ranks and conditions, that thousands are deeply wretched during nearly the whole of their existence in this world. Look at the disorder and confusion which reign in the moral world, the wars, the civil commotions, pregnant with fury and death; the domestick discord, the private and oft concealed griefs of thousands, look at these which pour over the world, and destroy every thing good or desirable. Go read your bible and learn all these come from God, as nearly all religionists hold, and tell me in what the goodness of God consists? I am free to confess from the existing state of things that so far from pronouncing God good, that is, if he be the authour and governour of the world as the bible declares him, I should consider him the reverse.

You pretend to reason from *facts*, but you in reality reason against facts. You assume the position God is good and because he is good, the existence of evil can be no objection to his goodness, and because evil exists now without destroying his goodness it may eternally exist. This conclusion, sir, is at war with common sense, with self evident facts. God you say is good: To whom is he good? To that feeble infant now in a paroxism of pain, gasping for its first breath and after a few hours of agony dies? May I be delivered from such goodness. He is good you say, and is he so to those thousands who languish in dungeons, to those he now overwhelms with the ocean's fury, with the volcanoe's rage or engulphs in the ruins of the earthquake? You may say so, but an angel from heaven should receive the *lie direct* if he should assert it: That is if no ultimate advantage is to redound to these victims sufficient to overbalance the pain they have endured.

But you may ask does not the bible declare God is good and do not these evils exist? Yes I admit both. I admit these evils exist, and that the bible declares God is good. But, sir, I deny the possibility that the declaration that God is good can be true, unless evil shall be so modified that man shall be a gainer by his existence.

You speak of "general good." Suppose sir there had been only one man created, what would have been for his general good? Happiness without any doubt. Does it alter the case by supposing there are two men? If you had been the only man created, you must admit your creation was no act of goodness unless it became the cause or occasion of more happiness than misery. May you not say the same of yourself if there be another created. Does my creation weaken your claims? or have I not just as strong a claim as I should have had, if you had not been created? Consider each individual, while discussing this question, as a separate and distinct creation, and your "general good" or the good of the whole will resolve itself into the good of all the parts.

You say the misery we endure is a punishment which God inflicts upon us for our sins, but this will not help the matter, unless you allow the punishment must terminate in good. Why does a good God possessed of all power make a man capable of sinning, place him in a situation where he knows he will sin, and then inflict endless punishment? Reconcile this with infinite goodness, and I will break a man's head, and tell it is through kindness, or make one as miserable as I can, and tell him it is because I love him so much.

You ask, "if it be consistent with goodness to punish us now, who shall say it will not be consistent to punish us eternally, or who shall say how long this punishment may be continued before it encroach upon goodness?"

The answer, sir, is easy. Your child disobeys you. You inflict a suitable chastisement, one which is beneficial and you have done a good act. But take a club big as you can wield with both hands and beat that little smiling girl of yours, as long as she can live, or as long as you can inflict the blows, do this sir, and I leave the parent to decide its *goodness*. Apply this and the first member of your question is answered. The second is just as easily answered: Punishment ceases to be just and consequently good, the moment it produces a greater quantity of pain than it returns of pleasure.

You mention some examples of suffering and evil but as I do not perceive their bearing on the question I must pass them over. But

sir I cannot forbear noticing one of your expressions, "I would" you say "had I the power, provided I should not be found fighting against God, destroy evil of every name and nature from the earth." Now this is one of the most singular confessions of a man in your situation I ever heard. Would you indeed destroy evil and suffering of every kind, and is nothing but power wanting? What think you of God? Has he the power? Allow him then to have as good a disposition as you manifest, and the world will be happy. But you seem to doubt if you should really undertake to destroy evil of every kind whether you should not be found fighting against God: Surely you must think very highly of your God to be afraid to combat evil lest you should be found fighting against him. Do you really think God is opposed to the destruction of evil? Your words imply it and your arguments seem to confirm it. Pray tell me in what your God's goodness consists?

You say it is consistent with God to punish eternally. This is your second position but you must prove your first, for if you fail in that you cannot support your second. I think you have failed in the first. For before you can prove it you must show that God is good to the being he makes miserable or that he may make one wretched and claim that one's love and gratitude. This you have not done, this you cannot do. I have neither time nor room in this letter to reply to the last position you have illustrated, but will consider what you have there advanced and give you my thoughts upon it soon. In the mean time I wish you to reply to what is here advanced and also continue the argument under your third head. Presenting these hasty remarks to your candour, I remain,

Yours, &c.
O. A. Brownson.

A CARD.

The Rev. Mr. Simon Vanity whose writings would immortalize a Dutch theologian, is informed his allusions are understood and despised; he is further informed the judgement of the publick may ere long assure him he had better confine himself to his old practice of dissecting *Musquetoe bills*. The argument lies here, that his mind can believe the Moon is "green cheese" and the Sun an icicle, and therefore, he is wonderfully well calculated to enlighten the mind by stating his own convictions. His threats are as contemptible as his thoughts, and if reiterated shall return with tenfold vengeance upon his own head. His motives are easily ascertained and if told would change his name from Vanity to Chagrin. NOBODY.

Died—At Cayuga Creek, on the 10th inst. Mr *Hiram Hill*, in the 29th year of his age. His complaint was a slow consumption which after an illness of two years and one month carried him off. Mr. Hill was late from Woodstock, Vermont, where his parents reside and most of his connections.

Poetick Department.

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

DISCRETION.

Sweet discretion, lovely power!
Noble and auspicious guest!
Thou canst cheer the darkest hour,
Thou canst make us truly blest.

When the stormy waves of passion
Threaten to o'erwhelm the soul,
Thou canst still them, O discretion!
Thou their fury canst control.

He who is to thee a stranger,
Is exposed to every snare,
Every wile that can endanger
Man's repose and comfort here.

To each practice vile, injurious,
He's perpetually a prey;
Lawless passions, wild and furious,
Rule him oft with deadly sway.

Oft the maid through indiscretion,
Mourns her melancholy fate,
Sees too late her sad digression,
Her imprudence sees too late.

Thou sav'st thousands from destruction,
On the wild tumultuous sea,
Who give ear to thy instruction—
Thousands sink, for want of thee.

They who follow thy direction,
Pleasures find with no alloy,
They enjoy thy kind protection,
Sweet tranquillity enjoy.

In the ruler of a nation,
President, or chief, or king,
Family or association,
Thou surpassest ev'ry thing.

Washington of true discretion
Had an all-sufficient share;
He redeem'd us from oppression—
By his valour and his care.

In a military leader,
In a high or low degree,
In an advocate or pleader,
Nought, discretion! is like thee.

Thou inestimable treasure,
Nought thy value can excel;
Come sweet source of heav'nly pleasure
Condescend with me to dwell.

Give me O! divine discretion,
All thy excellence to share,
O! may I have full possession
Of that quality so rare.

May thy hand propitious guide me,
Thy glad presence cheer me still,
Then whatever change betide me,
I shall triumph over ill. J. M. D.

☞*The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. Doubleday, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

Doubleday & Allen, Printers.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1829. [NO. 12.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

BY MENZIES RAYNER.

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.—Matthew xxv. 46.

A former discourse upon this passage was principally employed in preparing the way for a rational and consistent illustration and understanding of it; by showing the inconsistencies necessarily involved in the doctrine of endless punishment, supposed to be contained in it.

Such an interpretation of the passage leads to a result, shocking to reason; repugnant to every benevolent principle of nature and grace; utterly irreconcilable with many other plain and positive declarations of scripture; gives a most fearful and forbidding representation of the character, disposition and conduct of the Supreme Being, and veils his attributes in an eternal gloom.

The text is commonly claimed as decisive proof of the truth of the doctrine of endless punishment; and for this purpose is referred to more frequently, and with more confidence, than any other passage. If it can be satisfactorily shown that *that* does not support the doctrine, the confidence of its advocates concerning it, must be shaken; for this, together with the account of the rich man and Lazarus, and the supposed irrecoverable perdition of Judas, are relied upon as its main pillars: and among these alleged authorities, the text is regarded as pre-eminent. Let us then proceed to enquire into its true and consistent meaning, in the connection in which it is found, and in agreement with other passages, which may tend to throw light upon it, and assist in its illustration. It cannot, we think, fail to be discovered by the attentive reader, that the whole of the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew, is one continued discourse upon one particular subject, namely, the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, with the signs which should *precede*—the circumstances which should *accompany*—and the events which should *follow*, that extraordinary visitation of Divine Providence. Indeed, the latter part of the 23d chapter is upon the same subject, but was not addressed to the same persons; at least not to the same exclusive of others. The 24th and 25th chapters contain a discourse of our Saviour to his disciples *alone*, which is a circumstance of no small importance, as will hereafter be noticed. The 23d chapter was addressed to the disciples and many *others together*—and is thus introduced by the evangelist.—"Then spake Jesus to the *multitude* and to his disciples saying," &c. The latter part of this chapter is too remarkable to be passed over without particular notice, especially as it has an important bearing upon the subject under consideration. The greater part of this discourse was addressed to the heads of the Jewish people—the Scribes and Pharisees, whom he repeatedly names; calls them fools—blind guides—children of hell, (and who made their proselites two fold more so than themselves,)—serpents, and a generation of vipers. He then prophetically declares their perverseness and cruelty, until the measure of their corruption and wickedness should be filled up, and wrath come upon them to the uttermost. "Behold I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; (alluding to the Apostles, Evangelists, and teachers, who should be sent to preach the gospel, and call them to repentance.) And some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barrachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the Altar." And now mark, *when*, and upon whom these threatened judgements and calamities were to fall, and to be executed? Was it in another world, and in a future state of existence? Nothing like this is said, or intimated: but, "verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation." Thus plainly showing, that the evils threatened, were of a temporal nature, and were to take place, before the then present generation should have passed away. And now mark again, I entreat you, the pathetick lamentation of Jesus, over the obstinate and unreclaimed inhabitants of the ill-fated Jerusalem. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" What an expressive metaphor is here employed! "The hen sees a bird of prey coming; she makes a noise to assemble her chickens, that she may cover them with

her wings from the danger. The Roman eagle is about to pounce upon the Jewish state and people. Jesus cries throughout the land, publishing the gospel of reconciliation. They would not assemble, and the Roman eagle came and destroyed them"—"How often would I have gathered thy children—and ye would not." And now, *behold*—behold what? What would a modern orthodox preacher say to such impenitent and incorrigible offenders? Would he not endeavour to alarm them by fearful representations of immortal misery in another world? crying, "behold ye are standing on the brink of hell—on the verge of a bottomless pit, full of fire and brimstone; kindled and perpetuated by the endless wrath of Jehovah, into which ye are every moment liable to be plunged, and from which there is no redemption, to the endless ages of eternity." Such, you will allow, is a very common style of preaching—of preaching what is called the "glad tidings of the gospel revelation." (What a pity it is that so many of the heathen, are so long without hearing this *joyful sound!*) But what did Jesus say to these Jewish sinners, who knew not the day of their visitation? Behold your house or temple, is left unto you desolate. It is no longer the house of God's holiness, or the place where his honour dwelleth. And what more? "I say unto you, ye shall not see me, henceforth." I will remove my gospel, and withdraw my protection from you. What! forever? Will our calamities never cease? Will our punishment be endless? And shall the glory of Israel never be restored? The blessed Jesus says not this; but he says that which fully intimates a very different result. "Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Even an orthodox commentator, in the true style of universal grace, thus remarks upon this passage; "Ye shall not see me till after the fullness of the Gentiles is brought in, when the word of life shall again be sent unto you; then will ye rejoice, and bless, and praise him that cometh in the name of the Lord, with full and final salvation, for the lost sheep of the house of Israel." I have dwelt thus particularly upon the 23d chapter, because it is upon the same subject with that which occupies the 24th and 25th chapters; and because while our Saviour predicts with so much sympathy and regret, the *temporal* calamities which were coming upon the Jewish people, and describes them so particularly, yet he gives no intimation that they were exposed to endless punishment in a future state: warns them of no such danger, sheds not a tear, utters no lamentation, and discovers no anxiety on that account. Sees thousands of these miserable beings, ready to drop into hell, according to the common creed, without emotion, without regret.

The 24th chapter commences by saying;—"And Jesus went out and departed from the temple; and his disciples came to him to show him the buildings of the temple. He had finished his discourse to the multitude; and now, to his disciples alone, *privately*, and at their particular request, he resumes the same subject, and continues it to the end of the 25th chapter. St. Mark, in relating the same circumstances, mentions that Jesus, being desired to notice the buildings of the temple, declared to them that of those great buildings, there should not be left one stone upon another, that should not be thrown down. And then Peter, and James, and Andrew, asked him, *privately*. "Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled? It therefore clearly appears that this discourse of our Saviour, comprising the whole of these two chapters, and concluding with the text, was addressed to the disciples alone, for their particular information.

This circumstance suggests a most important consideration. Upon the supposition that the doctrine of future and endless punishment is contained in the text, it exhibits the singular and unaccountable fact, that our Saviour *privately* admonished his disciples of the danger of infinite sufferings after death, in another world, of which to others and in his publick teaching he gave no warning, or intimation.—That whilst he threatened the wicked and obstinate Jews *only* with the desolation of their temple, the subversion of their civil and religious institutions, and other *temporal*, and comparatively momentary calamities; he immediately after, revealed and declared to his own selected friends and followers, the tremendous doctrine of endless torments! Now if this doctrine of endless punishment be true, it cannot be a *private* doctrine, intended only for the especial warning of a few, and those least liable to it, which would seem to be the case if our Saviour inculcated it in a private discourse with his disciples, whilst in his publick teaching, in which he particularly enumerated other evils, and dangers, of infinitely less consequence, he gave no warnings, and made no mention of that. I know not how this may appear to others. In my apprehension it has great weight, and comes with the force of an almost irresistible argument *against* the doctrine of endless punishment, claimed to be specially declared in the text; which, as we have shown, is part of a *private* discourse of our Saviour to his disciples.

It may be proper briefly to notice the somewhat different terms in which the different Evangelists state the question proposed to our Saviour at this time, by the disciples. St Mark says, they come to him privately saying, "Tell us when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" alluding to what he had just said concerning the destruction of the temple. St. Luke states the question in nearly the same

terms, as follows: They asked him, saying, Master, but when shall these things be? and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass? St. Matthew says, the disciples came to him privately saying, "Tell us when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

The end of the world here, unquestionably means the end of the age, and would have been properly so rendered; that is the end of the Jewish age, or dispensation. And the coming of Christ here, and in many other places, refers to the same period, and to events which were then to take place. This is evident, because our Saviour declares that all those things should come to pass before that generation should have passed away.

Our Lord proceeds agreeably to the request of the disciples, to describe the signs which should precede his coming; as the appearance of false Christs, and false prophets; wars and commotions; pestilence and famine; great earthquakes—or some think the meaning to be great popular commotions. And St. Luke adds, fearful sights, and great signs from heaven.

St Matthew says, "*Then* shall they deliver you up to be afflicted," &c. St. Luke says, "*before* all these, they shall lay their hands on you and persecute you; delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons." This is fully illustrated in the history of the acts of the Apostles. By reason of these trials and persecutions, our Saviour forewarns them, that many would be offended, and the love of many wax cold: but promises that, he that should endure to the end—should steadfastly adhere to his christian profession, and follow the directions given, should be *saved*, or delivered from the coming destruction. He tells them the gospel must first be preached in all the world. This may particularly mean the Roman empire, although it is certain that before the destruction of Jerusalem, the gospel was preached among a great many, perhaps most other nations.

He mentions the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, referring, doubtless to the Roman army, with their idolatrous ensigns and images, which were an abomination to the Jews; and the abomination which maketh desolate. When they should see this army investing Jerusalem, then were they to flee to the mountains nor stop to take with them the most necessary articles.

Our Saviour laments the situation of those who should be in a condition unfavourable to so hasty a flight; and assures them that, then should be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to that time, no, nor ever should be. I cannot but wonder that in all this description he makes no allusion to the endless punishments and sorrows of another world. If he knew of such a state, might we not expect him to have said something like *this*. Then indeed there will be great distress, such as never was before, and shall never be again in this world: but all this is as nothing, compared with the inconceivable and never ending torments, into which these hardened and guilty wretches will then be plunged. Yet in all the very particular description given of the calamities which would attend the desolation of Jerusalem, our Saviour never once intimates that its miserable inhabitants were liable to, or were in any danger of greater sufferings in a future state; but on the contrary declares that there *never* again shall be so great affliction and distress.

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days, (says our Saviour,) shall the Sun be darkened, and the Moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken." Commentators have generally understood this and what follows, as descriptive of Christ's coming to judge the world, in the last day; but there is not the least intimation given of any such change in the subject of his discourse; and as Doct. Clark remarks upon the passage, "the word *immediately*"—immediately after the tribulation of those days, (And St. Mark has it, "But *in* those days, after that tribulation.") This plainly "shows that our Lord is not speaking of any distant event, but of something immediately consequent on the calamities already predicted; and *that* must be the destruction of Jerusalem. The language is highly figurative, "the sun shall be darkened and the moon shall not give her light." "The Jewish heaven shall perish, and the sun and moon of its glory and happiness, shall be darkened—brought to nothing. The *sun* is the religion of the *church*, the *moon* is the government of the *state;* and the stars are the judges and doctors of both."—(Lightfoot.) In prophetick language, great commotions upon earth are often represented by such bold metaphors. Thus, the fall of Babylon is represented by the "stars and constellations of heaven withdrawing their light; and the sun and moon being darkened."—Isaiah xiii. 9, 10. The destruction of Egypt, by the heaven being covered; the sun enveloped in a cloud; and the moon withholding her light.—Ez. xxxii. 7, 8. The destruction of the Jews by Antiochus, is represented by casting down some of the host of heaven, and the stars to the ground.—Dan. viii. 10. And this very destruction of Jerusalem is represented by the prophet Joel by showing wonders in the heaven and in the earth; darkening the sun, and turning the moon into blood. This general mode of describing these judgements, leaves no room to doubt the propriety of its application in the present case.

The appearing of the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and all the tribes of the earth, that is, all the Jewish tribes, (who were particularly interested in these events,) mourning, when

they should see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, all refer to the same events, the destruction of the temple, and of the Jewish state. The sending his angels with a great sound of a trumpet to gather his elect, &c., plainly refers to the gospel preached by the Apostles for a witness to all nations; which was to take place before this end of the world, or rather of the Jewish age, should come. That we are correct in the explanation, and in the application of these events the following verses clearly evince; and they show the particular care which our Saviour took, that his disciples might not misunderstand his meaning. Now says he, "learn a parable of the fig tree, when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." And still more explicitly—"Verily I say unto you, *this generation shall not pass*, till all these things be fulfilled." Therefore the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, the powers of heaven being shaken, the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven the tribes of the earth mourning, the trumpet sounding, and the elect being gathered—were all of them events which were to take place in this world, and before the whole of that generation in which our Saviour lived, should have passed away. As yet, therefore, we see nothing which refers to another world, or a future state of existence. Our Saviour proceeds to urge it upon his disciples, (from their ignorance of the day and hour when those things would take place,) to watch, and be ready to make their timely escape from the devoted city. "Watch therefore for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." With this advice and caution, enforced by an appropriate similitude, the 24th chapter ends. The next begins with the noted parable of the ten virgins. Never was there a more unfortunate division of chapters, than in this place. It is in the midst of a continued discourse of our Saviour upon one particular and important subject, as appears by the commencement of the 25th chapter, which refers immediately to his discourse in the preceding one, with which it is closely connected, and without considering it in this connexion, its meaning cannot be understood. "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." Here the question naturally arises, "when will this likeness be exhibited?" This refers us at once to the circumstances and events foretold and described in the preceding chapter; and the parable of the wise and foolish virgins in *this*, agrees in substance and design with the parable of a faithful and wise servant, and of a negligent and evil one, which is given in the close of *that*. They both, forcibly inculcate on the disciples the necessity of watching, and being ready to meet those great events, which had just been described, and which are summarily contained in the phrase, "*the coming of the Son of man*"—his coming in "power and glory." "Watch, therefore," says he, in the close of the 24th chapter,—"for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." "Therefore be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh."

And now observe the close and application of the parable of the ten virgins, the whole design of which is to enforce the necessity of watchfulness, in view of the events above described. The wise virgins are represented as constantly watching for the coming of the bridegroom, and when he came, they, being ready, went in with him, to the marriage. The foolish virgins afterwards came, and desired to be admitted, but it was too late, for the door was shut. "Watch therefore," says our Saviour, "for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." St. Luke, in reference to the same event, represents the language of our Saviour as still more emphatical. Immediately after declaring that that generation should not pass away, till all should be fulfilled, he says, "take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so *that day* come upon you unawares. Watch ye therefore and pray always that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things." What things? not what should take place in another world, but which should occur during *that generation*—that ye may escape all these things that shall come to pass, and—stand before the Son of man. In order to impress important truths deeply upon the minds of his hearers, our Saviour frequently illustrated and enforced them by several successive parables, all upon the same subject, and having the same application. Hence the parable of the lost sheep—the lost piece of silver, and the prodigal son. Hence also the parable of the mustard seed—of the leaven—of the treasure hid in a field—and of the pearl of great price—and many others. So here in this discourse of our Saviour to his disciples, he first declares to them the certain destruction of Jerusalem—the signs which should precede it, and the distress and horrour which would attend it; directs them at the appearance of certain signs which he gave them, to escape from Judea with all possible haste, and flee to the mountains. And then, to impress upon their minds the necessity of watchfulness, and of holding themselves in continual readiness for that great event, the *time* of which they knew not, but which would be sudden and unexpected; he enforces his admonition by five successive parables. The first is that of the budding of the fig-tree; the second that of the two servants, the one wise and faithful, the other, wicked and negligent. This is in the very close of the 24th chapter. Immediately suc-

ceeding this, is the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, in the beginning of the 25th chapter, and ought not to be separated from the former by any thing more than a common period. After this and closely connected with it, follows the parable of the talents ; in which the happy consequences of fidelity, and the fatal effects of inattention and indolence are forcibly represented. On the close of this parable, I would offer a remark, which I think important. It is said that the Lord of these servants gave orders that the unprofitable one who had hid his talent in the earth, should be cast into outer darkness—where there shall be *weeping and gnashing of teeth*. These expressions are often employed in giving the most terrifick descriptions of the torments of the damned in a future state, to which they are supposed to refer. I would therefore remark that the words " outer darkness," occur in the gospel by the Evangelists three times, and the words, " gnashing of teeth," accompanied by the word " weeping or wailing," seven times, and no more. And it is very remarkable that wherever those phrases occur, either that of " outer darkness," or " weeping and gnashing of teeth" in *every* instance they are connected with a description of the state of the Jewish people ;—their rejection of christianity, and their consequent deprivation of its enjoyment and blessings. It was *their* situation which our Saviour described by the phrases " outer darkness" and " gnashing of teeth," and which he never applied to any others. They are, as it were, shut out, and excluded from the light of the gospel, separated from its privileges, its consolations, and its hopes, by a dark, and hitherto impassable gulf, of inveterate prejudice, and obstinate rejection of their own Messiah.—Blindness has happened to them, and must remain, till the fullness of the Gentiles be come in ; then the fatal gulph shall be removed ;—ungodliness shall be turned away from them, by the great deliverer out of Zion, and so all Israel shall be saved, " for this is my covenant unto them, (saith the Lord,) when I shall take away their sins : for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

A few general observations will only be added at this time. If the common and generally received, or at least, generally inculcated views of this subject be correct—the human family, ordained and produced by the same Almighty Creator, and descending from one common parent ; alike made subject to vanity, though not willingly, yet all alike desiring happiness. If the common doctrine be true, this human family, whatever may have been the original design of the Creator, must be eternally separated ; and a large portion of it, O tremendous thought ! must exist in endless wretchedness and fell despair ! under the wrath and curse of Jehovah !—their maker, whose offspring they are ! However, reason, and nature benevolence and grace, revolt at the idea.—Such, it is said, is the doctrine contained in the scriptures, and especially in the text. We have examined the preceding context, all upon *one*, and the *same* subject ; we have not found it there. We have indeed, passed in review the greatest sufferings and calamities that the world ever knew, and greater than shall ever be known again ; but they are temporal ; and by a reference to other scriptures, we see to the final close of them, and the glorious result which shall ultimately follow, even to that most offending and most afflicted people, our elder brethren, the Jews. They have stumbled, but not to fall forever, they have been broken off, but shall again be grafted in ; for, saith the Apostle, God is able to do it. With such assurances, and a vast many more, we cannot believe that those scriptures are truly understood, or consistently interpreted, which are supposed to contain the doctrine of endless punishment, and God's eternal hatred and wrath. I cannot close this subject more suitably, or more agreeable to my own views, than in the language of an excellent writer, and brother preacher of Universal grace, and reconciliation. " At midnight, it is said, when soft sleep infuses her vivifying balm through man's weary limbs ; at his hour of repose and solemn stillness, when the world is wrapt in slumber, and silence starts at her own echo ; the Archangel's trump, followed by the crash of worlds, shall summon all the nations of the living and the dead before the dread tribunal ! Amid the thunders, flames and terrours of the universal conflagration, the awful judge,—with lightnings playing on his countenance, assumes his seat upon his stupendous throne. Heaven and earth have passed away ;—Trembling before their angry judge, stand the guilty nations, while blackened Angels await the signal, to enforce the dread decree, and hurl them down to eternal wo ! Such is the awful doom which our spiritual guides are continually fulminating in our ears. I pity the man, from my heart I pity the man, who thinks me to believe that eternal torture will be the doom of all who have too much discernment to subscribe to the senseless jargons of our creed-makers, and of those who attempt to guide our souls. An endless hell may be my doom, my eternal dwelling place ; but if any one wishes me to believe it, he must no longer tell me of a God whose nature is love—of a Saviour who is able and willing to save to the uttermost ; nor assure me that this Saviour will ride forth conquering and to conquer. That his march shall be glorious, and his reign prosperous, and that ' he will not fail nor be discouraged, till he shall have set judgement in the earth, and the Isles shall wait for his law.' For while I am taught to believe this, I can never believe that eternal wo will be the portion of any of the human family."

THE ESSAYIST.

SERVICE TO GOD.—NO. 2.

Having in my last ascertained the reason why we are bound to serve God, I am prepared in this to answer the question, what service we can render him?

Service commonly implies aid or assistance, in this sense we can render none to God, and the term is thus misapplied. Our actions cannot reach him. We can neither augment or diminish his felicity. But God designs the happiness of mankind; all the dispensions of his providence or grace, are directed to this end. As far as we propose the same object to ourselves, as far as our labours tend to produce this object, so far we are engaged in the same work with God, and may be said to assist him. In this sense serving God is serving man, God being independent of all his creatures can be supposed to labour only for their good. Hence I can perceive no other service we can render him, than to join in the same benevolent work, and endeavor to render ourselves and those with whom we are associated happy.

What shall we do? Ask experience what course of conduct has been found most successful, ask nature what is the law of our felicity, and ascertain it by studying man in his individual and social capacity. Man may be considered as a sensual or an intellectual being; in either he has rights that must not be violated. As a sensual being his enjoyment consists in the gratification of his senses, his appetites, or his natural propensities. Some of them will be found absolutely necessary to the preservation, of the individual, or the propagation of the species. These are by no means to be suppressed; nature always tells the truth; there is no danger in following her directions; and we should ever regard as enemies to the best good of society, those who allow too great or improper indulgence of the senses, or enforce too great abstemiousness. All our appetites, passions, and natural instincts are necessary to our existence and felicity when regulated by temperance.

Man is formed for society. It is his home, and the isolated being is as much lost, as the lone sheep astray upon the mountain. Hence we consider, those labour under a mistake, who in order to maintain their virtue, retire from society and immure themselves in monastick solitude. Being social creatures we can assist each other; we can add something to each other's pleasures, and all our powers whether physical or intellectual, should be directed to the enlargement of the sum of general felicity. Whatever course of conduct is found by experience or observation, to be most conducive to the enjoyment of all the rights we possess as individuals, or as members of society, is to be pursued; whatever has an opposite tendency to be rejected. Whatever sentiments or principles to be believed will have this happyfying effect, or are calculated to make us seek the happiness of each other, we may suppose true: whatever has an opposite effect, we may reject as pernicious. We may now particularize.—What sentiments, if believed, will make men most virtuous, and consequently most happy? This is an important enquiry, for the actions of men bear considerable relation to the opinions they adopt. Narrow and contracted sentiments will produce an uncharitable practice, for it is contrary to the established laws of human action, that a person who believes the greater part of mankind are enemies to God, deserving severest punishment, should be a universal philanthropist, or practice upon the principle of universal benevolence. He will think his duty does not require him to study their good, consequently he will refuse to extend his good offices to them; the better we think of mankind the more shall we love them, and the more we love them, the more shall we labour to make them happy. Hence it has always been, that publick benefactors have been men of enlarged and liberal minds, men not bound by narrow and partial creeds, not compelled by them to consider themselves the inhabitants of a particular town or village, and obliged to support the interests of a particular party, but men whose sentiments are free and independant; and whose benevolent feelings grasp in the arms of their affection, the whole world of mankind.—So if we would contribute to the happiness of our brethren, or if we wish to lay the foundation for the broadest sphere of usefulness, we must cast our eyes into heaven, mark the love of God, higher than that; cast our wondering gaze over the expanse of nature, and find it deeper than the vast abyss. We must behold God good unto all, and his tender mercies over all the works of his hands. We must take this survey from our own hearts, on the same model, and imbibe the same benevolent feelings. Then we shall attempt to imitate God, and as far as our abilities extend, we shall like him, be "good unto all."

Faith or sentiments to be believed, are useless unless they have this effect, and those only are to be believed which most directly produce it. And none will do it except those that include the benevolence of God and the dignity of human nature, and represent them in so clear and amiable a point of view, that the heart will naturally love both. Hence we discover that all those ideas which speak of God's partiality, and his enmity to the human race, are calculated to damp our gratitude to God or not likely to lead us to love those whom he has made. We reject all those notions which sink man below his natural level, or degrade his rank in the scale of being, as unfavourable to our philanthropick feelings.

Yet we must be careful not to be bigoted against bigotry, nor illiberal against illiberality.

If we adopt enlarged and manly views, we shall be charitable towards those who are less enlightened or less liberal. We should have a faith so broad, that we can bear with all the peculiarities and perhaps inconsistences of others, and embrace them with the same kindness and esteem, as though their faith was like ours. Faith itself is not considered goodness, and is to be regarded only as it is subservient to a benevolent course of conduct. Should we find a man that discharges the several moral obligations, incumbent on his station in life, the question should never be asked what is his belief? It is no matter what he believes; "it cannot be wrong," while his "life is in the right." But in a word, the belief of a God to whom we are accountable, of a future state of virtue and felicity, a belief that we are all brethren, bound on the same voyage, and destined to the same haven, will in my opinion, be favorable to the discharge of our several moral obligations.

The general rule is now developed and this is nearly all that can be done. To pursue the rule through all the minuteness of detail, would be an endless task, and probably be of little utility, if accomplished. Such, indeed, is the scantiness of our knowledge, and the paucity of our means of improving it, that we must content ourselves with some general observations, the application of which time and circumstance must ascertain.

The end to be ever kept in view is *happiness: virtue* is the means by which we must hope to attain it; hence, whatever promotes virtue is desirable, and may not improperly be denominated the service of God. This opens the field in which we are to labour, fixes an object towards which, as the magnet of the soul, we are to point every power we possess: this establishes the bounds of our wishes, and prescribes, by a comprehensive maxim, the path we are to walk. Here man's mind is not distracted by arbitrary divisions of his duty. He is not told it consists of three parts—one to God, one to his neighbour and one to himself. His duty to his God is performed by that to his neighbour, and that to his neighbour is done when he *properly* serves himself. Here is no room for arbitrary sacrifices, and unnatural rites and ceremonies. All institutions not founded upon the individual nature, or social relations of man, stand upon no good authority, and are to be considered useless or pernicious. All service to God must be brought to the tribunal of usefulness to man. Whatever in the nature of things, is of no imaginable utility to him, is to be considered an idle whim, or a remnant of the ignorance of antiquity.

The absence of the principle we have endeavoured to develope, has been attended with the most deleterious consequences to human felicity. Supposing his duty to God were different from that to his neighbour, man has originated those absurd notions which, under the name of religion, have spread over every portion of the globe, and sunk the human mind to the depths of degradation and wretchedness. Thus also have originated the bloody wars and persecutions, which have drenched the earth in her richest blood, for the support of *religious faith.* From the same erroneous supposition, sprung all that theological wrangling which pervades every department of society, destroying the confidence of its members in each other, banishing the social virtues, driving peace from the bosom, and tranquility from the domestick circle. Humanity has wept over the scene; called aloud from philanthropy to teach infatuated man, that *no act can be pleasing to God, that is not conducive to human enjoyment.*

The benefactors of the human race have checked their flight, descended from the clouds turned their attention to the various phenomena with which they were surrounded, penetrated the arcana of nature, and sought to render them all subservient to our felicity. They have sought to recall man to the consideration of their own wants; for to these attention must be paid; these must be modified to the means of their innocent gratification, and the whole of our duty will be found, when analysed, to consist in the removal of our own uneasiness, with the least possible injury to the enjoyment of others, and conducing to the general happiness as much as in us lies.

We are bound to increase the sum of general felicity, by relieving the distressed and comforting the disconsolate, by instructing the ignorant, by supporting the weak, and relieving the decrepitude and loneliness of the aged; but these will be found, on strict examination, to be only so many ramifications of the principles we have established, for satisfying our individual wants. The wisdom of God has made the happiness of all, to consist in the felicity of each. Does the inquirer ask, what he shall do to serve God? the answer is, go study your own good, learn in what your true interest consists, and when you have ascertained this, bend all your faculties to its acquisition. But take this caution; you have no interest that is unconnected with the rest of mankind. All are bound by the law of their natures to each other; it is impossible that *that* should be one's true interest, which in the least diminishes the happiness of others.—Hence, when you ascertain that your present course of conduct is prejudicial to the felicity of your brethren, abandon it,—your own interest requires an alteration.

But perhaps it will here be asked, are we never to think of God? We are to consider him the authour of our existence, the benefactor of our lives, in whom we live, move and have our being. We are to consider him as the great principle of life and intelligence, by which all the operations of nature are produ-

ced. Not to think of this being, is impossible. Every object we behold proclaims his existence, and each spire of grass reminds us of his presence. A grateful emotion will arise to him in the heart of every rational man, who contemplates his works. This emotion is proper, but it is not a duty.* It cannot be enforced by a command, nor produced by a penalty.---It springs spontaneously, or not at all. It is, indeed, a source of the sublimest enjoyment to the heart that feels it, and he who wishes for the greatest quantity of happiness, will, if rightly instructed, neglect no opportunity to make himself acquainted with the wonderful productions of this unseen hand. Acquaintance with these will exalt his conceptions of their authour, and consequently increase his grateful emotions.

But shall we not pray to this invisible agency? If by prayer be meant a request that some advantage be conferred upon us that was not originally designed for us it is improper. To dictate in any manner, what this being shall or ought to do, is the height of impiety. If by prayer be meant an acknowledgement of the blessings we enjoy, the exercise is proper, because by this act we are led more particularly to contemplate the nature of our possessions, which will increase the tribute of gratitude, which in its turn, will enlarge the sum of our felicity.

Another reason may be assigned for the utility of prayer, when understandingly performed; by contemplating just and benevolent principles, we obtain a desire to possess them, and shall generally act in proportion to the strength of this desire. By praying to God our minds rest upon the source of all good, and the exercise is calculated to soften the heart, and dispose us to acts of kindness and benevolence, the chief fountain of human happiness. Under this view, prayer is proper; but when it is considered as a service to God, and this is made to consist in the act, without reference to its effect on the heart of one who prays, it becomes highly improper.

The same remarks will apply with little variation, to assembling together, and to all the usual acts called divine service. None of them, in themselves considered, are of any value; but if they enlighten the mind, warm the heart with gratitude to God, make us kind and benevolent to each other, and lead us to the practice of humanity in all its forms, they may be called useful; any farther than this, they are useless.

* When our correspondent says "this emotion (meaning gratitude) is not a duty," we presume he meant that it was not a duty in itself considered, aside from the benefits arising from it. But that it is a duty, so far as it is productive of happiness, is fairly inferred from his premises; for happiness is, in a great measure dependent on the performance of duty.

EDITOR.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

TO JAMES LUCKEY.—NO. 3.

Dear Sir: I have received your second letter containing a reply to my last, and also a continuation of your argument under the third position assumed in your first. You will please accept my thanks for the favour, and my assurance that I am pleased with the earnestness with which you vindicate your views though I may not admit the conclusions of your argument.

I redeem my promise, by proceeding to give a partial review of your statement, that "it is in perfect accordance with the mercy and goodness of God, connected as they are with his other attributes that the wicked be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." By this statement I understand you to mean, that God can consistently with his mercy and goodness make the wicked endlessly miserable. I do not ask whether he will do it or not, but whether he can do it and retain his character for goodness? There are few subjects in theology more important than this, and no questions, under existing circumstances, can be asked in reference to the Deity, more deserving our serious attention.

I do not pretend to scan the Almighty. I pretend to know nothing more of him, than he has revealed in his works and his word. But this question does not require us to explore the depths of the Divinity, it presents a plain subject easy to be understood and capable of being answered without "rushing into the skies." Is it consistent with goodness to make any creature endlessly miserable? Do we understand the nature of the question? God moved by his own will, without the least compulsion, creates a certain being, gives him all the susceptibilities, powers and faculties which he does or can possess, places this being in such circumstances, that he remains a sinner during his probationary state, and then makes him endlessly miserable. Can he do this and be good? Can he do this and prove himself just? Let us consider for one moment what is goodness. I have before defined the term, but I must do it again. Now language was not invented to express the attributes of God, but things with which we come in more immediate contact. Such things as have a tendency to prolong our existence and to produce or increase pleasurable emotions in our bosoms we term good. Such as have an opposite tendency, that is, destroy our existence or make us miserable we call bad or evil. This is what the terms good and evil, when strictly defined mean among us. Now these terms must mean the same thing when applied to God or they are misapplied. Now if Mr. Luckey will say, that God creates a being who, in consequence of that creation, is endlessly miserable, it is a self evident position, that God is not good to that individual. You may disguise the matter as you will, it resolves itself into this, God is not, he cannot, in the

nature of things, be good to one who has to groan eternally in hell.

"If you say" you remark, "that God must save all or his goodness must be relinquished, I say he must damn all or his justice must be relinquished." How will you accommodate this matter? To my thinking, very much as Solomon proposed to adjust the dispute between the two harlots, viz. by dividing the child.—Goodness declares all mankind should be happy, justice according to your notions says all ought to be damned, and Deity being obliged to pay as much attention to the voice of one as of the other attempts to compromise the affair, by taking part to heaven, and sending the rest to hell. This sir, is dividing the child in good earnest. Let humanity speak.

Now the case is, we often speak of the attributes of God in a manner calculated to produce the illusion that he is divided; we speak of justice and mercy as if they were distinct beings, of goodness and love as though they were separate entities, but the fact is there are no such things as justice and mercy and goodness, &c. in existence, or at least we can form no idea of any abstract existences to be called by these names, yet because it is the custom of speakers and writers to use the abstract for the concrete, we are apt to imagine there are some such beings.

There are just and merciful agents. We say justice is an attribute of the Deity, it were better to say God is just. We say "justice of God," but what is it? Simply God acting in a certain manner towards his creatures. We use the expression "mercy of God," what do we mean? Simply God relieving the sufferers of their pain. Of his "goodness" his making his creatures happy. God is good, whatever he does is goodness. Justice is only a particular display of goodness, or if you please justice is the foundation of all goodness, I care not which way you turn the matter. God is good, is just, is merciful; whatever he does is just, is good, is merciful; none of these propositions contradict the other, but are all acts of the same individual, of the same indivisible agent, who does not, cannot change, but may labour for the good of different classes of individuals, and as he labours for one or another class, he is said to be just or merciful.

Now it is all useless saying God's justice requires one thing and his mercy requires another thing right in opposition. I wish our metaphysical divines would either study metaphysics thoroughly or else let them entirely alone. There is no difficulty in ascertaining the origin of the illusion under which your mind, as well as the minds of others, labour. By some means or other a vague notion has been imbibed that a something called justice demands the eternal punishment of the wicked, and a something else called mercy is anxious for the salvation of all. Now there is no such thing that a wise man, when he considers the subject, can believe. The notion is borrowed from earthly courts, and we have vainly imagined heaven adopts the same principles as do the governments of earth.

We speak about bringing a man to justice, and this too long after the crime committed may have been repented of, and the man become a peaceful and perhaps virtuous citizen. Never was language more misapplied. We may rest assured that if we borrow our notions of the criminal jurisprudence of heaven from the criminal code of earth, we shall charge the Almighty with a practice that ever has disgraced every earthly tribunal.

You say that God labours for the "general good." Here you have borrowed your theology from the imperfection of men. No doubt a sovereign must content himself with promoting the general good of his kingdom. Why? because it is better some few of his subjects should be miserable than it would be to have all happy? You will hardly assign this reason. The reason is plain: The sovereign is an imperfect being and he cannot make all happy. His subjects have a variety of dispositions, follow various employments, and he cannot always check the evil of the one or always ensure the success of the other. Hence if he make them generally happy, we say he does well, not because there can be nothing better, but for the reason he has done all his limited powers would allow him to do.—Now sir, if you choose to bring Deity down to the level of an earthly sovereign, I may admit he does very well considering his power, but I might sometimes regret he was unable to make all his subjects happy. Then there would be no tears throughout his domain, then we should hear no widow complain, no fatherless child cry for the father executed for his crime, for then I may say no crime would have been committed.

But you may say it is essential to all good governments, that is, it is for the general good that offenders be punished. Why? Because it is a beautiful or an entertaining spectacle to see one "hang by the neck until he is dead," or because it is very exhilirating to the benevolent soul to see some poor son of misfortune confined in the gloomy cell. I risk nothing by an appeal to your own feelings in this case. It is perhaps proper that offenders in an earthly government should be punished, because governments have not yet become able to give to all the power and disposition to do right. But if the government were able to prevent the crime I hardly think it can be just for that government to punish an offender. For certainly it is better to prevent than to punish crime.

Now sir, will you say God cannot punish crime? or will you say that it is a proof of his goodness, that he permits us to run on in sin until we have ruined ourselves, that he may gratify himself by sending us to hell to roast eternally? Or will you, to relieve your embarrassment call it a "mystery" and silence the voice of reason by exclaiming, "God moves in a mysterious way!" The subject is perfectly plain. Every body knows it is better to prevent a man from doing wrong than it is to punish him after he has done it, for punishment but increases the amount of misery.

You speak about David, say he "gave thanks that the first-born of Egypt were smitten," &c. all this may be very well. But you will recollect the scriptures call David a "man of blood," and he might have another title which I will leave you to give. I will only add

I am not particularly anxious to learn morality or to take my ideas of justice from one who was a notorious violator of both the sixth and the seventh precept of the decalogue. The other instances you enumerated may be dismissed, for they took place so long ago, that the circumstances, necessary to enable us to form a correct judgement about them are forgotten.

You attempt to prove punishment is not disciplinary, but it is unnecessary: for I deny all *punishment* and consequently do not contend it is disciplinary. Now do not misunderstand me. I believe

"The Universal cause
Acts not by partial, but by general laws."

He has made us, given us all the powers he designed should belong to our rank in the scale of being. Now according to the manner in which these powers are developed, we are happy or miserable. This I believe is the principle of his government. He works no miracles to prevent the natural consequences of our actions. Now if it can be shown that we shall continue to sin to all eternity we shall be miserable, or if we are eternally among sinners, we shall be eternally unhappy.

I have no evidence that God will ever change, and I do not believe his government will ever be in the least changed, but all the results of that government may not yet be developed, and that which now seems imperfect may be but the first principles, which when carried out in detail, will present us all the perfection, beauty and felicity, we can wish. But so far as I know any thing about the subject, I believe Deity has placed our fortune in our own hands, and it depends on our own exertions, whether we are happy or miserable. So it is here and so I believe it will be hereafter.

Now I say man has the means of making himself happy, that is, God has placed the means within his reach. God will not exercise these means for us; we must exercise them for ourselves, and the only question, with me, is, will all men exercise them? If you sir will grant me two things, I will ask you to do no more. First that God has placed these means within the reach of all, and second that he will never take them away. The first is a sentiment of your church and I think you will not deny it. The second is true, if God be unchangeably good, which I think you will admit to be a fact. My conclusion is that all men have and always will have, within their reach the means of making themselves happy. Will they exercise these means? Scripture must decide. My next shall adduce the proof from the sacred volume.

Your last letter shall be duly noticed. Our readers may compare your reply to number one of mine, and draw their own inferences. You have availed yourself of an argument which precludes all reply from me. I mean your ignorance of certain things and your distrust of your own abilities, your diffidence in your own reason; and, as much you have produced appears to have been written under the conviction reason is a useless thing, it is unnecessary to reason against it. Your scriptural arguments will be considered in my next. Yours, &c.

O. A. Brownson.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

I agree with our correspondent in most of his statements, as well as in all the positions he has laboured to establish. We often err when speaking of the attributes of God, by introducing arbitrary distinctions. God is just: what do we mean? Simply that he does no wrong. He is good. He not only does no injury, but he does good. Justice is goodness manifested to all so far as to give every one his just dues. Mercy is the same goodness manifested to sufferers, and shows itself in relieving distress. Ed.

Mr. Editor:

Sir—I have thought proper to suspend for the present any further examination of our friend Stow's theory, until I shall have paid some attention to one John Ingersoll, who is making considerable noise in these parts. I understand this publick teacher has taken up his residence in the village of Jordan, a little north of this; is under a tolerably comfortable salary, and is proclaiming the heart-cheering and soul-reviving doctrine of endless misery to the people in that quarter. His location being within the precincts of our friend Stow's jurisdiction, we are occasionally favoured with a slight "touch of the terrible."

I have had a short interview with this Rev. gentleman, which lasted two or three hours, being a sufficient length of time to answer some dozen questions and queries of his, which questions and queries were proposed, I conclude, for the purpose of trying to make it appear that Universalists made void the mercy of God, by maintaining with the bible that God will render to every man according to the deeds done in the body. That the atonement of Christ is set aside, and of no account, because they do not believe that the sufferings and death of Christ, in themselves considered, save mankind from an endless hell, or entitle them to eternal happiness in the world of glory.

I did not intend to bring the subject of that interview before the publick; but as the Rev. gentleman has since delivered a discourse on the same subject, in which similar statements and things were advanced, I think he must be attended to. I believe he dwells much on the subject; tells much about the mercy of God—what it is and what it is not; and seems fully confident that his private interpretation is according to the true faith. In my opinion he says many things against which the scriptures seem to depose. I must therefore pay him attention, as I profess to have some faith in the scriptures.

His remarks on the term mercy appear to me somewhat singular. He says there is no mercy in a parent who takes good care of his children, because it is his duty to do so.

"People," says Mr. Ingersoll, "tell about such an one's being very merciful to his chil-

dren. Such a man or woman is very merciful. The fact is, there is not a *particle* of *mercy* in all this." Thus, according to Mr. Ingersoll's interpretation, man cannot exercise a particle of mercy when he is doing his duty! He further says, "there is no mercy exercised by a person who brings up and takes good care of children not his own, out of charity."—Here, he says, is "not one particle of mercy exercised." But why? "Because," says he, "the man has done no more than his duty,—no more than the law of God requires him to do. There is no mercy in all this. He has exercised goodness towards them, but not a particle of mercy."

Hence, Mr. Editor, you will discover that according to Mr. Ingersoll's theory, the term mercy is a rare term, and ought never to be employed in conversation, i. e. when we say "man is merciful," or, "the merciful man."

Man cannot exercise mercy, because man does only what the law of God requires. The bible too is very defective on this point when it says, "blessed are the merciful," when the fact is, according to Mr. Ingersoll's interpretation, there is not a merciful man on earth; for mercy is an act that cannot be exercised by man.

When the bible says, "and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, love *mercy*," &c. It requires more than man can do, for man cannot exercise mercy.

The bible in many places recognises man as a being capable of exercising mercy. The term mercy is frequently applied to man. But I suspect the translation is wrong. I wish, Mr. Editor, you would see to this. Mr. Ingersoll's theory must be correct, for he is an orthodox teacher in Israel.

Let us examine his theory a little further. He says, "God is not merciful to angels! Angels are holy beings, and have never transgressed the law of God—have always done right. Hence, God has never exercised any mercy towards them! No, not one *particle!!*" Stop Mr. Ingersoll; a little too fast. God says, by the mouth of David, that his "tender mercies are over all his works."—Psalms 145th, 9th. I will say to Mr. Ingersoll, in the language of his own words, "Take care! There's a counterpart to that!" Mr. Ingersoll says, "God *never exercised one particle of mercy towards those* angels!" "Take care!" Are not the angels a part of God's works? and if so, are not God's mercies over them? So the bible says, Mr. Ingersoll to the contrary notwithstanding. Rather presumptuous I should think for a priest to parade himself up in a pulpit and tell the congregation, in the face of God's word, that He "*never exercised one particle of mercy* towards the angels!!" But perhaps the bible is wrong. Mr. Ingersoll appears very positive in his declarations. It may be a wrong translation. It probably ought to read, "the Lord is good to all, and his *goodness* is over all his works."

Mercy, according to Mr. Ingersoll's definition, must be a kind of something that is wrong. Man cannot exercise a "particle" of it, when he does right, i. e. when he does his duty and obeys the law of God, which he is bound to obey. God cannot exercise mercy to angels, or to men, unless he does something opposed to justice. He cannot to men, for Mr. Ingersoll says, "the justice of God demands eternal punishment." He says "God exercised no mercy to the angels who sinned in heaven and were thrust down to hell. God dealt with them justly. No mercy ever reached their case, nor ever will." It seems then, according to this theory, that it is a pretty difficult matter for the Lord to exercise mercy to angels, unless he deals with them unjustly.—For in order for God to have mercy on them, he must suffer them to sin, and after they have sinned, his law, his justice requires their endless damnation. But if mercy be exercised towards them, his justice must be dispensed with: for Mr. Ingersoll says, "Law is law.—Law and justice is one thing, mercy is another." Therefore, in order for God to exercise mercy, he must do something wrong or unjustly. Let us, therefore, pray God that he will deal unjustly with angels, and, if our petitions are granted, there will be mercy exercised towards them.

Well, if God deals justly with angels, and he does not deal otherwise with them, for Mr. I. says, "God never exercised a particle of mercy towards them, with those angels who have sinned and those who have not," his justice may require him to deal with those angels who have not sinned, as he has with those who have. Their case must, I think, be deplorable, unless something wrong, injustice or mercy (which is about the same thing according to Mr. Ingersoll's interpretation) interferes in their behalf.

As the Lord has shown a specimen of his justice towards a part of the angels, by suffering them to sin, and then tormenting them eternally for sinning, what security have angels that they will not share the same fate? and what security have "men and women," that they will not share the same fate soon after they arrive at heaven? So much for Mr. Ingersoll's theory. What consoling doctrine this must be to the citizens of Jordan. Such instructions must be very useful and comforting to the "men and women" in that quarter. I have examined his system with respect to God's dealings with angels, and think I shall not embrace it. I am still of the opinion that the Lord is not only good to all, but that his *tender mercies* are over all his works, not excepting even the angels.

Let us now examine what further the Rev. gentleman says concerning God's moral gov-

ernment. One of his declarations during our interview, and previous to the discourse above alluded to, was, "God never deals with those in whom he bestows mercy according to the just demands of his law;" which is the same as to say, God will not "render to every man according to the deeds done in the body," contrary to the express testimony of the scriptures. David says, "Unto the Lord belong mercies, for he renders to every man according to his work." But Mr. Ingersoll says no—"Law is law." God renders to no man according to his work, unless he damns him eternally. Probably David would never have made the above assertion had he known that such a man as John Ingersoll would rise up in these days and give such a curious definition to the term mercy. Had he believed in Mr. I's theory, and understood the word mercy as well, he would have exclaimed, "Unto the Lord belongs damnation, for thou renderest to every man according to his work;" or, he might have exclaimed, unto the Lord belong mercies, for thou *dost not* render to every man according to his work. He never would have said, "mercy and truth have met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." No: "Law is law." Mercy is one thing; justice or righteousness is another—quite the reverse.

Let Noah Webster give the definition of the word damn and its derivatives, and Mr. John Ingersoll the definition of the words justice and mercy, and their derivatives, and I shall soon be under the necessity of having another kind of bibles; for the old ones will not fit their definitions.

The word damned Mr. Webster says means "sentenced to everlasting punishment in a future state." Hence, when we read in the bible that "he that doubteth is damned;" it does not mean that he is damned now, but will be damned; that is, "sent to everlasting punishment in a future state," however strong his faith may be after doubting. Had Paul understood the definition of these words as well as these doubty champions of orthodoxy, he never would have represented some "men and women" as "receiving to themselves damnation." As "having damnation" (in the present tense) "because they cast off their first faith.—Rom. xiii. 2.—1 Tim. v. 12. Had the Saviour understood the term, the rare term mercy, according to Mr. Ingersoll's interpretation, he never would have said to his hearers, "be ye therefore merciful." Had the prophet David understood the term justice according to Mr. Ingersoll's interpretation, that the justice of God requires the endless damnation of men and angels, he could not, we think, have asserted that "*justice and judgement* was the habitation of God's throne," and at the same time address the Almighty, saying, "all nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name," and "*mercy* and truth shall go before thy face."

I have now done with Mr. Ingersoll for the present. I did intend to give him a hint or two respecting his pulpit wrath against Sabbath breaking stages, proprietors and drivers, and his holy zeal for the Pioneer line, but must let this pass for the present. I would remind him however, of an important fact, that ancient hypocrites made a great noise about Sabbath breakers. They accounted the Saviour of the world a Sabbath breaker. They manifested great zeal for the observance of the Sabbath. They were very righteous and despised others. They paid tithe of mint, anise and cummin; fasted twice a week, and were as zealous Sabbath keepers as any now-a-days.—I do not know whether they could brow-beat, beg money, denounce as infidels and Sabbath breakers all those who did not fall down and worship a certain line of stages, or not; but it is certain they could do many things, and with all, "pass over judgment and the love of God," as many Pioneer religionists do now. I refer Mr. Ingersoll to ancient things, when he introduces that subject again in the pulpit. I wish him well. I harbour no ill will against him. I think I have a right, when he gets out of his latitude, to say to him, "take care! there's a counterpart to that." A. C.

Elbridge. 1829.

June 6th, 1829.

DEAR SIR: I have received your letter, No. 2, in which you positively acknowledge that the three positions taken by me in my first letter, if proved, might sustain my notions of the final destination of the wicked, but seem to think the proof comes far short of supporting my theory, or confuting yours.

There is no doubt but that our ardent attachment to our favourite creeds will prejudice our minds a little; but for myself, as far as human nature will admit, I wish to be open to conviction, and to treat this subject with that *dignity* the concerns of eternity demand.

It seems, by the tenour of your letter, that you think you have driven me to the necessity of proving that God is good to the *individual* he *punishes*. I have given you my notions of that point in my other letter, which remains unnoticed, except what you have said on the subject of God's dealing with his creatures with reference to their "general good." To this you say, "we should consider every individual as a *separate creation*." With a moment's reflection you will not wonder if I should manifest more surprise at this assertion of yours, than you did at my disposition to destroy evil, for it is certainly most absurd.

It strikes me forcibly that we should take things as they *are*; that we should reason from the *creation* of God as he has *created* it, with reference to all its *connections* and *dependen-*

eies; and with this view of the subject, it will not, I trust, be disputed that God will have an undoubted right to continue the same government and inflict the same penalties *forever*, that he always has done: at least it remains with you to show that his administration will be changed.

But you say, you *infer* his administration will be changed; for if he were to deal with his creatures in an other world as he does in this, that is, if he were to punish them by way of a *penalty*, he could not be good. Do you not now see that your whole creed depends upon *your* notions of what would be right and wrong in the *infinite God*.

For myself, I think it is not only unsafe but extremely absurd to rest our hopes of salvation on conclusions drawn from any thing that our corrupt natures and ignorant minds may tell us is right or wrong in a God.

I dare not trust to such a conclusion; first, because I know that my ignorance of the government of God will not permit me to be an accurate judge of what is right or wrong, with respect to that government.

Secondly, I dare not trust my salvation on this hypothesis, because facts convince me that God does not now, nor never has, dealt with his creatures according to your notions of right and wrong.

Thirdly, I dare not trust my hopes of salvation on this hypothesis, because I have nothing to warrant me in the conclusion that God ever will change his administration; and, to say the least, I know not but he may *always* continue to inflict a penal or exemplary punishment upon the wicked. This is the shortest view I can take of the subject.

In answer to that part of your letter which calls on me to prove the goodness of God, or to reconcile the present government of God with goodness, I should say I do not think it is my prerogative to call in question the government of God. In my first letter I think I gave a sufficient answer to this question, in my second position, and as I have the promise of an answer from you to those arguments, I shall not present any more till I see how you dispose of them.

I would observe, however, on this point, that I have been and still am astonished at the *arrogance* of man in attempting to scan the *Almighty!* What business have we to catechise the Deity! What do we know about

"The strong connections and vice dependencies"

of the universe:

"Why charge we heaven in those, in these acquit,"
In both to reason right is to *submit*."

And yet we act as though we would

"Snatch from his hand the balance and the rod,
Re-judge his justice, be the God of God."

"In pride, in reasoning pride our errour lies,
All quit their spheres and rush into the skies;
Pride still is aiming at the blest abodes,
Men would be angels, angels would be Gods."

When the Lord shall admit us as his counsellors—when he shall show us all the secret springs, the wonderful operations, the nice connection, and the distant bearings of his moral government, then, and not till then, we may be justifiable in forming a conclusion of what is right or wrong in his moral government.

But at present, I protest against reasoning from our notions of right and wrong, *against* the known government of God. He can take in all creation at one glance. He can govern, and does govern, with reference to the "general good" of all his creatures.

We should not put too high an estimation upon ourselves as *individuals*, when weighed in the balance of the whole: for

"God sees, with *equal* eye,
A *hero* perish or a *sparrow* fall;
Atoms or systems, into ruin hurl'd,
And now a *bubble* burst and now a *world*."

If God should see fit to punish those who refuse his mercy—if he should deprive those of his salvation who have scorned to accept it—if he should refuse to admit in his *presence*, eternally, those who have disdained his offers of mercy through life, what right have you or I to say it is wrong, any more than we have to say it was wrong for him to strike dead *Ananias* and *Saphira*.

In neither case will it be presumed the punishment was *disciplinary;* and if God must act with reference to the good of *every individual*, just have the kindness to tell me what good accrued to Ananias and Saphira. I wish, if you choose to pursue this part of the subject any farther, you would have the kindness not to impute to me "God is good, *because* he is good," for I believe I am "not justly."

I shall now commence the argument of my third position; that is, that the revelation of God, according to his *word*, as well as his providence, is against your conclusion. First, I ask, with what propriety do the scriptures call the punishment of the wicked the *curse* of the divine law; or can that be a curse which is the only *effectual* thing that Almighty wisdom could possibly devise to *prepare* the finally impenitent for happiness.

If your creed be true, the sinner will enjoy a much more effectual means of grace in hell than ever he did on earth. It will be the same as a medicine administered to a patient, which may not be in itself very palatable, indeed, but yet in the end would save the patient's life.—Would you call it a *curse*? Certainly not.—And, if your hell fire is a much greater blessing than the *atonement*, for what the atonement could not do, "in that it was weak," hell fire is reserved to accomplish.

It is admitted, I believe, that the glory of God is more fully illustrated in the plan of redemption, than the calling forth a world from ancient night, or producing order from a gloomy chaos. But, according to your hypothesis, it

is reserved for hell fire to eclipse the whole. And a portion of the celestial beings, to say the least, will be under the necessity, when they bring forth the head stone, of altering their song, and while some are crying, grace, grace unto it, others will be crying *fire, fire.* This, it strikes me, will rather be a *jargon.*

But, seriously, I appeal to every unprejudiced mind, with what kind of propriety hell fire, or any punishment that is necessarily inflicted upon the wicked, can be called a *curse* so long as it is not only necessary, but absolutely *essential* to their eternal happiness.

On this hypothesis, the apostles and fathers of old acted a very unwise part in suffering as much as they did, and even dying martyrs to "persuade men" to avoid this *curse.* It is certain that if any course should be taken to deprive the sinner of this most excellent means of grace, this only *effectual* means, it would be very wrong; and indeed if our Saviour were to rescue the sinner from this "*curse of the divine law,*" it would be no blessing to him, but the reverse. For you will bear in mind that nothing but *hell fire* will humble him and make him submit to the government of heaven.

I am well acquainted with the answers generally given by the Universalists to those passages of scripture which limitarians quote to substantiate eternal punishment, and some answers carry much plausibility and apparent fairness with them. But I have never seen an answer to the declaration that our Lord made to his disciples concerning Judas, that would weigh one straw in the scale of *common sense.*

The declarations of Jeremiah and Job can be considered nothing more nor less than the effects of impatience from smarting under the hand of affliction. But when our Lord makes a *solemn declaration,* every body must admit he meant what he said. "It had been good for that man," said he, "if he had never been born." Now one of two things appears to me perfectly evident from this declaration; first, that our Saviour did not tell the truth; or, secondly, that the final restoration of all mankind cannot be.

With what propriety could our Saviour have said this, if your hypothesis be correct; for admitting Judas to have been punished millions of millions of years, still he would have had an *eternity* of felicity, or if you can comprehend the idea, he would have had no *less time* to range the *celestial fields,* and his creation must certainly have been a blessing to him in the end. So I think my conclusion is perfectly logical, that either our Saviour or your Reverence must be in an error. This is all that I shall propose under this head at present. I shall wait your reply with impatience.

Yours, &c.

JAMES LUCKEY.

TO THE EDITOR.

MR. EDITOR—

An article appeared in the 2d or 3d No. of the "Rochester Observer," concerning Mr. Bell, and stating that "Universalism is no test in a dying hour." Though some remarks have been made heretofore in No. 14 and 18, Vol. 6, of the Advocate, yet I take the liberty to state a few facts on the occasion, as my name has been called in question. If you please, I will give my orthodox, or calvinistick brethren a few specimens, of calvinism's being no test in a dying hour, and not always in a living hour, when they fancy death to be near.

David W. Bell was a young man, with whom I was intimately acquainted. I was always pleased with his company, being a man or rather a boy, possessed of superiour talents to any of his age within the circle of my acquaintance. He taught school near where I lived, and was often at my house. His deportment was easy and his life strictly moral. In all my acquaintance with him, never did a vulgar word escape his lips. When he received the news of the death of his two brothers who resided in Windham, Green Co., he immediately dismissed his school and went home, and was soon taken with the same fever with which his brother died.

There he was surrounded with "hell torments," while sunk under the weight of his disease, weakened both in body and mind, and partially deranged, they, with his beloved father, wrought upon his mind till they overwhelmed it with despair and wretchedness. If he had been well, with no better arguments than can be found in his letter to his father (No. 30, Vol. V. Adv.) he would have put to flight a host of "damnationists" equal to that of Midian. It is very evident that he was not in his right mind, for he sent a message to his brother E. in Mendon, about business that never existed, exhorted his father to send to Z. T. and S. T. in Mendon, and tell them "the doctrine we have been striving to propagate, is an awful delusion." S. T. is a son of mine, and I well know that he undertakes to propagate no doctrine; he does not so much as read the *Universalian* writings that I take, though he lives in the same house with me. From these circumstances, I am convinced he was not in his right mind: though his father states in the Observer that he was. Now for an examination of Calvinistick death beds, and dying hours.

It is with pain I state the following about poor inconsistent *Calvinism.* There lived in the town of Southeast, Duchess, now Putnam county, an aged gentleman who had filled many stations in *church and state,* was considered one of the fore-most men in the town—been *deacon* of a church for thirty years—judge of the county court, and his conduct through life,

considered worthy of example. I was personally acquainted with him, being born and bred in the town where he lived and died. It was said by those who attended him in his last moments, that he would howl and cry saying, "I have never been a Christian, have 'eaten and drunk damnation to my own soul.'" He would rub and wreath his arms about and say, "*Before to-morrow's rising sun these limbs will be broiling in hell.*" In ravings like these, and in the frantick rage of despair, consequent upon a belief that God was his enemy, he bid adieu to the world and to hope.

A pretended preacher of the gospel (why I say "*pretended*" is because I call gospel, good news in opposition to hell-fire and damnation) not far from me was said to die in despair, reaping the comforts of that doctrine which proclaims God the enemy of the greater part of mankind. I heard a Calvinistick preacher of Avon say, whilst preaching a funeral sermon in Mendon, that to become a Christian one must be willing *to be damned for the glory of God*, and if they lost a near and dear friend, they must be so reconciled to God's government as to place their foot on the grave and say, "*If you are now sucking the flames of hell for breath, and suffering God Almighty's wrath, I'm content!!*" This same teacher of such submission to God's will and sovereignty, was taken sick, death stared him in the face, the terrours of hell got hold of him, and as much submission as he possessed and taught, he was not willing to go for *God's or Devil's* glory, and according to his own theory cannot be a Christian. I am no sceptick, he need not have produced the proof. God in his wisdom has permitted him to recover, and this very useful man still lives to enjoy the blessings of Him "who is good to all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works."

ZEBULON TOWNSEND.

Mendon, Monroe co. May, 1829.

NOTICE.

I have viewed with sentiments of sympathy and commiseration, the degraded and forlorn situation of the negroes of the South, particularly since it has been my fortune to be an eye-witness to their wretchedness, and the inhumanity of their masters. I consider it the duty of a Christian and liberal community, particularly in the state of New-York, to use the greatest efforts to farther the objects of the Manumission Society. I would therefore recommend to the inhabitants of W. that a meeting be held at the session-room, on Monday the 20th instant, for the purpose of forming a society, the object of which shall be the glorious emancipation of Sambo Quashum, one of the degraded race of Africa. *A friend to Africans.*

NOTICE.

The notice of "a friend to Africans" is recommended to the serious attention of the friends of humanity. In furtherance of his *glorious* object, I would recommend to the men, women and children of W. that a meeting be held on Tuesday, the 21st instant, at the session-room for the purpose of forming an auxiliary society, the object of which shall be, to procure materials for making one shirt for Sambo Quashum. *Universal Philanthropy.*

NOTICE.

The notice of "Universal Philanthropy" should not be neglected by a pious community. The young ladies of W. are requested to meet at my house, on Wednesday, the 22d instant, to take into consideration the propriety of forming a sub-auxiliary society for the purpose of *making up* Sambo Quashum's shirt. The object of the meeting is of the utmost importance, and requires the most mature deliberation; the young ladies are therefore requested to give an early and punctual attendance.

Widow Waddle.

NOTICE.

The attention of a feeling and *enlightened* community is earnestly called to the present deplorable condition of one of Sambo Quashum's shoes. The noble exertions which have already been made for the melioration of his condition, by the proposed organization of three several societies, deserve all praise. But it may be said, that while any thing remains to be done, nothing has been done. Poor Sambo Quashum, that child of oppressed Africa may now be seen wandering through our streets, at this inclement season, like a vagabond, with a hole in one of his shoes. All who feel an interest in the fate of *niggers*, not only in the village of W. but in the neighbouring villages are most earnestly solicited to meet at the court-house, on Thursday, the 23d instant, for the purpose of organizing a society to raise funds, for procuring a patch for Sambo Quashum's shoe. I have, with the most disinterested zeal, called upon the different shoe-makers in town (being fifteen in number) to ascertain the probable cost of the patch, and the price of mending the shoe. The following is the result of my enquiries.

Patch,	$00 12½
Attaching it to the shoe,	00 6¼
Total,	$00 18¾

With praise-worthy liberality the shoe-makers have resolved unanimously to incur the expense of putting on the patch, whenever it shall be provided, leaving, by computation, the amount of $00 12½ cents to be raised by the society.

Fellow-citizens and brethren, do not let the expense deter us from accomplishing an object so commendable. *Disinterested Zeal.*

NOTICE.

Viewing as I do with horrour the rappid advances that good eating is making in society, and being convinced that a love of good din-

ners evinces too much regard for the *frail things* of the world, and too little for our *purses*, it must strike the virtuous mind that a stop should be put to this growing evil. I understand that Sambo Quashum is in want of food. Let us then set a noble example of simplicity and economy in diet, and what our charity gives to others, let us not neglect to use ourselves. I would recommend a meeting of the inhabitants of W. to be held at the session-room for the purpose of organizing a society, whose object shall be, to procure a jonny-cake for Sambo Quashum. Said society to be called the W. Mush Society. *Doctor Sangrado.*

The ill health of the editor must be the apology for not giving in this number more from his own pen. Yet he trusts his readers will not complain. The sermon is deserving attention, and we trust will be read as will be the two to follow from the same text.

I take pleasure in recommending these sermons and should be highly gratified to forward the names of some of our friends as subscribers for the paper from which they are taken. Had all our editors treated me with the politeness as has brother Rayner, I should feel a weight of obligation though easy to bear, not easy to place upon them. But no matter. The black cloud we saw rising with threatening aspect has passed over without injury to my prospects. The Advocate we believe has survived the storm, and if we may place any reliance on the letters from intelligent individuals (laymen indeed) in every part of the country where our paper circulates, the ill advised measures of some of my brother editors and preachers have rather recoiled upon themselves than injured me, so it will always be with those who attempt to bear down a brother without cause.—Ed.

MARRIED—In Venice, by Rev. O. A. Brownson, Mr. *Erastus Lester*, of Venice, to Miss *Philena*, daughter of Levi Pierce, Esq. of Locke.

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

DIED.—At Royalton, Niagara co. (N. Y.) on the 23d of October 1828, of bleeding at the lungs, Laodicea, wife of Joshua Slayton, aged 34 years.

The following lines were composed by her husband and made use of at her funeral.

Weep not, fond husband o'er the tomb,
That shrouds thy faithful bride,
Weep not, that all her loving bloom,
Hath faded and hath died.

What though the light of heaven shone
In thy dear consort's smile:
What though that light forever flown,
No more thy grief beguile.

What though th'Almighty lender, soon
Recal'd that precious gem—
It shines with brighter rays upon
Heaven's jewel'd diadem.

Her offspring to thy care she left
To feed and clothe, and teach,
Instruct them in the way of life,
That they may with her meet.

The all of her that e'er could die,
Now sleeps beneath the sod,
The spark of immortality
Hath risen to its God.

Then, weeping husband cease to mourn,
The cruel spoiler's power,
That from thy arms thy bride was torn,
In her mid-summer's hour.

Weep not, dear children, o'er the grave,
That binds your mother dear.
Strive in this world to live in love,
Till death for you appear.

What though she left you in this world,
All motherless to roam—
In virtue strive to seek your God,
'Till he shall call you home.

Her loving acts for you have ceased—
Her hands that wrought are cold,
Her spirit that was oft oppressed,
Is now call'd home to God.

Although disease, her frame did seize,
And waste her flesh away;
She shines in brighter bloom than this,
In the eternal day.

The storms of life with her are o'er,
At rest, her peaceful breast;
The loudest winds that e'er can roar,
Can't break her peaceful rest.

Swift with the light of heaven, soars
Her soul unto its God,
And there, on the immortal shores,
Is chanting praises loud.

Look in her hands, see harps of gold,
On which her fingers play—
She sings a song that ne'er was told
On earth unto this day.

Let eyes of faith behold in this
A father's tender love,
That now has call'd her home to bliss,
In brighter realms above.

Come friends and neighbours, turn your eyes,
Upon that rising mound,
For soon 'twill be that we must die,
And slumber in the ground.

Then turn your eyes up to that land,
Where dwells the God of love,
Who will send down a heavenly band,
To carry us above.

Then weep not o'er the turfy tomb,
Where Lodicea lies,
But hope to see her brighter bloom,
In yonder smiling skies.

There all the sons of Adam shall
Surround the dazzling throne,
And God the judge of all the world,
The kindred nations own.

☞ Mr. S. O. Tazewell, Kingston, U. Canada, is an Agent for the Gospel Advocate.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. Doubleday, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

Doubleday & Allen, Printers.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1829. [NO. 13.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

BY MENZIES RAYNER.

" And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.—Matthew xxv. 46.

Our attention has already been employed in two discourses upon this important subject. The first was principally occupied in showing, by arguments founded on scripture and reason, the utter inconsistency, and inadmissibility of the doctrine of future and endless punishment, which has been generally supposed to be contained in the text. In the second, a careful examination was had of part of the 23d chapter of Matthew; the whole of the 24th, and the 25th, to the close of the 4th parable, that of the *talents;* immediately after which, follows the remarkable one of the sheep and the goats. It appears unaccountable, and very unreasonable, to suppose that our Saviour was all along before, speaking in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem; warning his disciples of that approaching and awful calamity, and pressing upon them the necessity of being constantly on their guard, lest that day should come upon them unawares—lest they should be unexpectedly surprised by *this coming of the son of man;* and yet, to suppose that in the close of this *private* discourse with his disciples, he, without giving the least intimation of it, suddenly changes the subject of his admonitions and counsels; gives an exhibition of events which were to take place in another world, and shifts the scene from time to eternity. Such a supposition, it must be allowed, is most unreasonable, and ought not to be admitted, if it can be fairly and consisteatly avoided. Dr. Clark, who allows that all the preceding events described by our Saviour, with all their circumstances, illustrations, and consequences, were of a *temporal* nature, and had their application in this world—still says, without attempting to assign any reason for it, that this last parable is to be understood, as referring to the *final judgement of the world.* After citing the 31st verse, which says, " When the Son of man shall come in his glory," &c. he asserts, that " *this* must be understood of Christ's coming at the last day, to judge mankind: though, (says he,) all the preceding part of the chapter may be applied (also) to the destruction of Jerusalem." Now if all the preceding part of this chapter, as well as the whole of the 24th is a continued discourse of our Saviour, confessedly upon one and the same subject; and if he gives no intimation of any change in the subject, why *must* this last part be understood as appertaining to the judgement of the last day? Our Saviour says no such thing; and the commentator gives not a single reason for this supposed transition. And mere human assertions, however positive, without evidence, are entitled to but little weight. But perhaps the expressions here used by Christ are so different from those before employed by him, that they warrant this difference in their reference and application. Let this then be carefully enquired into. The paragraph begins by saying, " When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." This is very similar to the language employed, where it is acknowledged to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem. For instance. " The powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn; when they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." This is as majestick a description as the one above, except that the Son of man is not here said to be attended by angels. But in another place, alluding to the same event, even *this* circumstance is not wanting. It is Matthew 16th and 27th. " For the Son of man shall come in the glory of the Father *with his angels;* and then he shall reward every man according to his works." And then to show beyond all conjecture, its intended application to events which were to take place in this world, and at no distant period; our Saviour immediately adds, " Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." There is a passage in Isaiah, bold and lofty almost without an example, which may properly be introduced here. It is in the 6th chapter of his prophesy, as follows: " I saw the Lord, sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the Seraphim; each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face; and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain did he fly. And one cried unto another,

and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory. And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke.—I also heard the voice of the Lord, saying—whom shall I send; and who will go for us? then said I, here am I, send me; and he said go and tell this people. Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed but perceive not: make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, &c.—Then said I, Lord, how long? and he answered, until the cities be wasted without inhabitant; and the houses without man, and the Lord have removed men far away, and there be a great forsaking in the land," &c. We could hardly fail to discover the true application of this prophecy, even if we had no particular guide to it; but it is remarkable that our Saviour refers to this very passage in Isaiah, and applies it to the Jews, in allusion to their approaching calamities. "Therefore," says he, "speak I to them in parables, because they, seeing, see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand: And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear and not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive; for this people's heart is waxed gross; and their ears are dull of hearing," &c. He then exhibits in parables, especially that of the tares of the field, and that of the net cast into the sea, their approaching destruction. All this is in the 14th chapter of Matthew; a comparison of which with the 6th chapter of Isaiah, makes it very evident that the events which are prophetically described by seeing the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, with his train filling the temple, and the seraphims about him, are the same with those represented in the New Testament by the end of the world; the coming of the Son of man with his angels, and his sitting on the throne of his glory, and that they have *all* long since, had their accomplishment in the Jewish nation, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the events and circumstances connected with it.

But it is said, in the passage, connected with the text, that at this coming of the Son of man, when he shall sit upon the throne of his glory, "before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left," &c. And in the sequel, it is said, that the latter shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the former into life eternal. This is commonly supposed to be a representation of the proceedings which will be had at the end or destruction of this material world, called the general judgement. Here let it be noticed, that an important position is commonly *assumed* as matter of fact—namely, that there *will be* a general judgement after death; when the whole human race shall at once, be assembled together; shall be summoned to appear, it is asserted, before the dread tribunal of Jehovah, to give a strict account of their conduct in this world, and accordingly be rewarded or punished eternally. The most particular, and terrifick descriptions are frequently given of the proceedings and events of that great day. And to doubt its certainty as thus specifically delineated, is considered as the height of presumption, and an evidence of the most hopeless infidelity. This general judgement, it is confidently stated, is to take place on the day of the general resurrection; in the morning of which, it is said the trumpet, the last trumpet will be sounded, its voice penetrating through the extended earth and sea, proclaiming, like ten thousand thunders, awake ye dead and come to judgement. That all, both the willing and the unwilling, shall be compelled to hear it, and repair to the judgement seat, the awful bar of their Almighty maker and judge, then and there to meet their last trial, and receive their final sentence, not according to his former infinite mercy, compassion, and benevolence; but, (as if an entire change had taken place in his views, and in his disposition,) according to the laws of inflexible justice, and unrelenting severity; confering infinite happiness upon a part, and dooming the rest to endless misery, according to the just deserts of each. Now to this view of a future judgement, there are, it is believed insurmountable objections, founded in reason, and in express warrants of scripture. First, because it intimates, either that the final destinies of mankind have not been previously determined with certainty, or else that the Almighty is determined to make a pompous display of his power and justice, without affecting any radical change, and which can answer no conceivable, or worthy purpose. For, be it remembered, it is the common opinion, that the eternal state of every man is immutably determined at death; hence the common remark, destitute however of any scripture authority, that "as death leaves us, judgement will find us." But if so, where is the necessity or propriety of this future judgement, this great day of *accounts;* of final trial, and definitive sentence? As if possibly through ignorance, or want of proper care, there may have been some irregularity or incorrectness in the former proceedings; in consequence of which, some may have been received to heaven, who ought to have gone to hell, whilst others may have been sent to the latter place, who should have been admitted to the former; and if so, that upon thorough examination, in this day of final settlement, such mistakes may be rectified. To me, there is an utter absurdity in the idea, that the eternal states of men are determined at death, at which moment they are received to a state of happiness, or doomed to the abodes of misery—and that perhaps thousands of years,

or millions of ages afterwards, they are to be called to their trial, to give an account of their conduct in this world, and to be rewarded or punished accordingly. This contradicts every reasonable idea of propriety, and of equity, which always supposes the trial to precede the determination of a case. Is it rational to imagine, that after a person has suffered ages of exquisite torment, he is then to be summoned before a tribunal to have that very conduct investigated, upon which those sufferings were predicated? Another objection to such a future judgement is, that it represents the eternal destinies of mankind as *uncertain*, and depending on their contingent actions in this momentary state of existence: and consequently that the Almighty has no fixed and certain purpose concerning them, which is not liable to be frustrated. But this is directly opposed to many express declarations of scripture, which, in reference to mankind, speak of God's eternal purpose, and the immutability of his counsel; of working all things after the counsel of his own will; and which declare that he will do all his pleasure.

Furthermore: if to admit the idea that the condition of every, or of any individual of the human race, was *uncertain* with the Creator, and is not known to him, would be to call in question his infinite knowledge, how can it be reconciled with infinite goodness and benevolence, that he should bring millions of beings into existence, knowing that they would be endlessly miserable? Known unto God, says the Apostle, are all his works from the beginning of the world. Hence we infer with certainty, that knowing as well the future and ultimate condition of mankind, as their various circumstances in this life, he must also have known consistently with his infinite benevolence, that the being, or existence which he determined to give, would, on the whole be desirable and happy, and that no contingencies should prevent it.

Another important objection to a future judgment, such as has been commonly described is, that it represents eternal life and felicity, as well as endless misery in a future state as depending on the doings of men in this world.—And if so, then salvation, even eternal salvation is of works, which the Apostle peremptorily denies. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast." "The gift of God is eternal life." "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Such, and many more are the objections, founded, it is believed, in scripture, as well as reason, to the doctrine of a future judgement, such as has been commonly inculcated and received.

The scriptures do often, in reference to mankind, speak of judgement—*the* judgement—the *day* of Judgement—the judgement seat, &c.—But that they do in any place declare or imply that there shall be a general judgement after death, which shall determine the endless happiness of some, and the perpetual misery of others, is not admitted. The only passage which expressly mentions a judgement after death, or rather, *the* judgement, is in the 9th of Hebrews; but the connection in which it is found, clearly shows that the death there mentioned, is to be understood figuratively, in reference to the office of the priesthood under the law, and that the judgement there declared, is to be taken in a good sense, as indicating the greater excellence, and the superiour advantages of the Priesthood of Christ, in bearing the sins of the many; and in his appearing the second time to those who look for him, without sin unto salvation. The most prominent passage brought to prove a judgement, and rewards and punishments after death, is *that* in the 5th of the 2d Corinthians. "For we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. But in this passage it should be carefully noted, that there are *supplied words* which are not in the original, and which are here very improperly supplied, because they materially alter the sense. Without these additional words, the passage would read thus: For we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *in body*, according to that he hath done, &c. This evidently confines the judgement spoken of to the present life, during a continuance in the body. It is the received opinion, as was before remarked, that the general judgement is to be immediately preceded by the general resurrection. To the important doctrine of the resurrection, we fully subscribe, and believe that it will be general or universal.—We agree also, that this glorious morning will be ushered in with a shout; but that it will be the shout of victory and of triumph, like that represented at laying the corner stone of creation; when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. The last trumpet also shall sound, but it will be the trumpet of a general jubilee, proclaiming an everlasting emancipation from sin, misery, and death. Let me cite you a couple of passages, and they are the only ones which describe the resurrection in these terms of splendid imagery. The first is in the 4th chapter of the 1st of Thessalonians. "I would not have you ignorant brethren concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope; for if ye believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we

which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a *shout*, with the voice of the archangel, and with the *trump* of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we be ever with the Lord." What a sublime and animating description is here given of the general resurrection; but not a word is said of a general judgement immediately to follow, full of terrour and dismay to any of the human race.

The other passage is in the 15th of the 1st Corinthians, and the description is equally sublime and animating. Almost the whole chapter is employed in proving and describing the resurrection and its consequences. He declares, "that as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; that the last enemy, death, shall be destroyed." But mark his language as he draws towards the close.—"Behold I shew you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; (for the trumpet shall sound) and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." What a sublime description. But Paul, when comes the last, the general judgement? Hast thou forgotten this most important article? Where is the flaming throne—the awful bar—the angry judge—with wrathful lightning in his countenance; charged with the wretched fate, the tremendous destiny of millions of Adam's guilty race? Here, if any where, accompanying a description of the general resurrection, was a fit occasion for an eloquent exhibition of the terrours of the last judgement; but the divinely inspired St. Paul, is silent upon the subject; the Apostle of the Gentiles names it not; he was never taught it by that Jesus whom he had persecuted; he knew it not. It is remarkable that in this whole description of the resurrection, its attendants, and its consequences, not one undesirable event is intimated; no gloomy idea is presented; no shade darkens the scene; but all is animating and brillant, triumphant and glorious. "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality—then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written. Death is swallowed up in victory. O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

These remarks and references, are not a digression from our subject. We were stating objections to the generally received opinions concerning a future judgement. This has uniformly been represented to take place at the general resurrection. We have examined the most remarkable and particular descriptions of this last named event, and we find no traces of such a judgement, or of the circumstances and the consequences which hoary tradition has connected with it.

We are now prepared to take further notice of this parabolical representation, which closes with the text. The whole is said to be a description of the last judgement, and is so stated in the contents at the head of the chapter. This however is but of human authority, and decides not the correctness of the interpretation.

We think there is no sufficient evidence of such an allusion, or that the passage is to be understood with such a reference; but rather, that it is part of a continued discourse upon the same subject, which, it is acknowledged, occupies the 24th chapter, as well as all the former part of this 25th, namely the calamities which were coming upon the Jewish people,—the destruction of their city and temple,—the subversion of their institutions and government, together with the triumphs of the gospel, and establishment of Christianity; all of which is comprehended in the terms, the coming of the Son of man in glory, or with power and great glory, and all the holy angels with him. In the whole account, there is no intimation given of a resurrection. I will here notice a criticism of Dr. Clark in his commentary upon this passage, together with a short remark which he subjoins. He observes that the word *holy*, here prefixed to *angels*, is omitted in many excellent manuscripts and versions, and among others, that Griesbach has left it out as spurious. According to which, the reading would be,—when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the *angels*, instead of, all the *holy* angels with him. He then remarks, (taking it for granted that the day of judgement is alluded to,) "that it is supposed by some, that our Lord will have *other* angels, (or messengers) with him in that day, besides the *holy* ones. The *evil* angels, says he, may be in attendance to take as their prey, those who shall be found on the left hand." Now this may be the genuine Orthodox opinion, although I have not seen it so stated before. According to this supposition, it seems that the Saviour of the world, when he shall come in his glory in the last day, is to be attended not only by his *holy angels*, but his *unholy devils*; *they* also must be had in requisition, to grace his triumph, to celebrate the honours of his cross, and his conquests, and contribute their just proportion to the brilliancy of the scene! The evil angels, says the commentator, may be in attendance to take as their prey, those who shall be found on his left hand! But have they not had them, or the most of them, already as their prey for ages? Were not these evil angels, or devils according to the Orthodox opinion, in attendance at their dying beds, to take the wretched souls as their prey, the moment they should leave the body, and convey them down, down, to the regions of never ending de-

spair and horrour? But now again, it is supposed, they are to be in attendance to take them as their *prey*, and the judge, of course, is ready to hand them over. This is Orthodoxy with a vengeance. My soul, come not thou into its secret! Jesus of Nazareth! is this the reward of thy labours and sufferings? Is this the result of the divine purposes and promises which in thy mediation, are all yea and amen? Is this the travail of thy soul, which thou wilt see and be satisfied? It cannot be; for thus runs the divine declaration. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand; he shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied. By this knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, (or the many) for he shall bear their iniquities." And having according to this prophesy, been lifted up from the earth, he will draw all men unto him. When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels (or messengers,) with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, &c. Let it be remarked here, that it is *nations*, and not *individuals*, which were to be separated; which therefore has not its application in a future general judgement, but which particularly applies to the Jewish people, who though dispersed and mingled among all nations, still retain their distinct national character, and separated in many respects from all other nations, a bye word, and a reproach among all; according to the sure word of prophesy. These nations being compared to sheep and goats, and their being placed on the right hand and on the left of the Son of man, are figurative representations, which fitly describe the rejected, dispersed, and degraded state of the Jewish nation, whilst many other nations have, and all others will, before them, enjoy the privileges and blessings of the gospel, for *they* are only to be brought in, with the fullness of the Gentiles. As this is an important part of the subject, I may on a future occasion, advert to it again, and illustrate it more fully.

The subject, it will be seen, still remains, in a considerable degree unexplored by us, and with respect to some very interesting particulars; they claim a careful and candid consideration, which shall be given in another discourse, and which will, it is presumed, close the discussion of this copious and important subject. Viewing the sacred scriptures as a revelation from God; and the gospel especially as the grand charter of our christian privileges and hopes, it must be very desirable to understand their correct meaning and application. In order to this they should be diligently enquired into, and carefully examined; as far as possible free from prejudice and preconceived opinions, either our own, or those of others: with minds sincere and open to conviction; desirous to know the truth, and when convinced of it, willing to embrace and avow it; follow wherever it shall lead, and to whatever reproaches and inconveniences it may subject us. There perhaps never was a time when this careful enquiry and investigation, was more necessary than at present, when not only many different sentiments, with regard to religious doctrines, are disseminated, but also many new schemes and plans are formed, and with great zeal prosecuted; all claiming to be for the promotion of the cause of religion—for the love of God, and the good of men. Numbers are in substance saying, "Lo here is Christ, and lo he is there." Surely then it must be important to know *where* he is; that is, where his truth is; the true doctrines of his gospel, the genuine spirit and temper of his mild, benevolent, peaceable, and heavenly religion; which being the true wisdom, descending from above, is, first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. If ye continue in my word, says Christ, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. Truth is always consistent with itself; and there is doubtless a harmony in the scriptures, and especially in the doctrines of the gospel, which if fully discovered would abundantly confirm our faith in them, and if clearly exhibited must convince the most sceptical. But when gross contradictions, and palpable absurdities are inculcated, under pretended authority from the bible, and from the gospel, how shall we wonder if many, openly, and many more secretly, disbelieve and reject them altogether? I am well persuaded, that upon a limitarian principle, of any grade, the scriptures cannot be reconciled and made consistent, because such a principle sets the divine *attributes* in opposition to each other, and of course, must do the same with the scriptures. It is favourable to the cause of truth, that notwithstanding the bigotry, superstition, and hypocrisy which still prevail, a spirit of inquiry in increasing, and going abroad. May it still increase more and more, that light and knowledge may also increase; till all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest,—Amen.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

MY CREED.

Almost every man has a creed. There are few who do not worship their creed with more devotion than they do their God, and labour a thousand times harder to support it than they do to support truth. Now I do not like to be singular, and I know not why I may not have a creed as well as other folks. But—if I publish my creed, consistency may require me to defend it, and when I have once enlisted self-love in its

defence, I may become blind to the truth and may choose rather to abide my first decision than to admit I have once decided wrong. But a creed I must and will have, and my readers shall know what it is.

My creed shall consist of FIVE points, and shall embrace all the essentials of true religion; and furthermore I wish to premise, that my creed was not adopted merely to-day, but has been cordially embraced, and of its correctness I have had no doubts, for at least nine months, though I may not have lived agreeably to its injunctions But we are all frail creatures and it is very difficult to find no discrepancy between a man's faith, and his practice. Moreover I would alledge in behalf of my creed, that it is plain, easy to be understood, and withal involves no mystery. The pious may, however, from this circumstance be led to doubt its *divine* origin, and Infidels may like it so well that I shall be shut out of the church. But I will state it—though I must still further alledge, that I believe it to be based on eternal truth, and that it is calculated, if obeyed, to harmonize the world and enable the vast family of man to live forever beneath the smiles of fraternal affection. But for the creed.

Art. I. I BELIEVE every individual of the human family should be HONEST.

Art. II. I BELIEVE that every one should be BENEVOLENT and KIND to all.

Art. III. I believe that every one should use his best endeavours to procure FOOD, CLOTHING and SHELTER for himself, and labour to enable all others to procure the same to the extent of his ability.

Art. IV. I BELIEVE every one should cultivate his *mental powers*, that he may open to himself a new source of enjoyment, and also be enabled to aid his brethren in their attempts to improve the condition of the human race, and to increase the sum of human happiness.

Art. V. I BELIEVE, that if all mankind act on these principles they serve God all they can serve him, that he who has this faith and conforms the nearest to what it enjoins, is the most acceptable unto God.

This O ye! who accuse me of Infidelity is my creed —read it, obey it and never again tell me I am a disbeliever. Do you ask for evidences of its correctness? find them where you can—in the bible, in the Koran in the volume of the universe, in our individual capacities, in our social relations or wherever else you can. The best evidence I can offer is that if any one will believe, and obey, he will want no evidence. That is to say, if any one will do the works here required, he will find so much pleasure in the performance that he will ever after wish to continue to do the same. I would quote scripture, but people say I do not believe it,—how they should know I do not, is more than I can divine. They have never derived that knowledge from myself for I have never had it to give. But there is one passage so much in point I will quote; "The ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace." But here is another still better; "Righteousness keepeth him that is upright in the way." "There shall no evil happen to the just." The lips of truth shall be established forever;" and, "The just man walketh in his integrity and his children are blessed after him." And again; "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." and "whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even the same unto them, for this is the law and the prophets." Moreover I must be permitted to quote still further. "But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." "Do good unto all men as you have opportunity." "But whoso hath this world's goods and seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" "Prove all things hold fast that which is good." "Apply thy heart unto instruction and thine ears unto the words of knowledge." "To do justice and judgement is more acceptable unto the Lord than sacrifice." "To love God—and his neighbour as himself is more than all whole burnt offerings." "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction and to keep ourself unspotted from the world." "And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also."

These among many other passages of the same import I might adduce to show my creed is scriptural, but presuming each one reads the bible for himself I leave it to him to find evidences in the book itself. I forbear to expatiate on the moral beauty of my creed or to dwell upon what I consider will be its salutary tendency; and, though not skilled in the language of cursing, I will yet say that to expect happiness without obedience to this creed is vain. I shall not tell people they shall go to hell if they do not believe it, but I will leave them, if they do not obey its injunctions, to say, whether they have not a hell in their own bosoms.

I have now stated my creed, yet I am not so vain as to suppose all will embrace it. The orthodox will reject it because it is not mysterious, and the priests generally, because it will require them to pay as much attention to the flock as they have hitherto paid to the fleece. The heterodox will dislike it, because it will require them to treat the orthodox as kindly as they do themselves, and what perhaps is still worse, it will not allow them to be illiberal against illiberality.—And Infidels of all descriptions will reject it because I have proved it by scripture. All hypocrites will condemn it because it strips off their mask and compels them to be useful in order to be respected. The selfish will anathematize because it requires them to regard the welfare of others. And the indolent will be outrageous upon it because it requires them to be active. Hence I conclude there will be only *few* who will hear it with gladness. As it is likely to meet opposition from every quarter, I shall flatter myself that it is true.

If any one complains it is defective, I will tell him if he performs all it enjoins, I will engage St. Peter shall open the gates of heaven, to admit him to the mansions of the blest. But I will just whisper in the ear of my reader, I conceive this creed to be the END

towards which all should labour, that I do *not say* it is unnecessary to believe any thing else, but that nothing else is useful any farther than it tends to this end. Now my reader, if you by believing that Jonah swallowed the whale, or the story about the witch of Endor, with various others of the same character, I say dear reader, that if believing these marvellous stories will make thee a better man, and a better man, whoever thou art, I know thou dost need to be, then I have not the least objection, even shouldst thou believe the moon is made of "green cheese." Now ye doctors of dividity hurl your anathemas. Let every one be HONEST.—ED

There are some who seem determined the publick shall believe the Gospel Advocate is an Infidel paper. I had written a long refutation of this charge with a design to present it to my readers, but upon second thought I believe I shall let it lie by for the present.

W. I. Reese has manifested a willingness to prove me something that is very bad. My columns are open to him, he is welcome to use them to prove that my sentiments are wrong if he can. There is no use in whining about a man's opinions, if you believe them false exhibit the evidence of your belief, if you believe them pernicious show to the world their evil tendency.

If Mr. Reese thinks I am wrong in my views of the Gospel, I will thank him to correct me, and my readers, I doubt not, will also thank him for his labour. I am no bigot. When convinced I have been mistaken, I will not persist in errour. Truth is what I want and if any one can help me to its acquisition, he shall have my warmest gratitude.

My reasons for naming Mr. Reese need not now be given, but I believe them amply sufficient to justify me for so doing. My readers I trust will be interested to see my sentiments pass the ordeal of his criticism, and if truth is elicited they will be amply paid for reading our remarks. Mr. Reese is no doubt orthodox at least an orthodox universalist, and he says I am wild, inconsistent, absurd, and probably fighting under false colours; some of these charges he has preferred publickly and others perhaps more privately. Let him come forward and support these charges in the meekness of the gospel and in the candour true philosophy always inspires. He shall have fair play, and the editor of the Gospel Advocate will reason the point, he hopes, to the satisfaction of the pious and to the convincing of all who are not *personally* prejudiced against him, that he is a firm believer in the Gospel of Christ.—ED.

ANCIENT HISTORY OF UNIVERSALISM.

This is a work recently published. Its author is Hosea Ballou, 2nd. pastor of a church in Roxbury, Mass. I have but just glanced at the work, but intend soon not only to read it but to give my readers some idea of what it contains. So far as I have examined it I am highly pleased, and must say I think it highly creditable, not merely to the authour nor to the denomination to which he is attached, but to the Christian church generally. Its neat classical style is its least praise. The sober judgement it exhibits, the impartiality, and the absence of that sectarian spirit which destroys the usefulness of many laboured works, by which it is characterized, must recommend it to every one who is desirous to form correct opinions concerning the notions which were entertained by the primitive Christians respecting a future state. I will only at this time add that altho' it is called a history of universalism, it will be found to give a pretty full account of all that can now be known respecting the opinoins of the ancient church whether universalist or limitarian; that is about a future state. I would say to my readers, that if they feel any anxiety on this subject, they cannot do better than to procure this work as soon as they can. It is a duodemico volume of 326 pages, printed on good paper with fair type and well bound.—For sale by the publisher of the Gospel Advocate, price $1,25.—ED.

ERRATA—Owing to the absence of the editor when our last paper went to press several errours of some importance occurred. On page 184 2d col. 23 lines from the bottom, for "we must take this survey from our own hearts," &c. read—we must take this survey; *form* our own hearts, &c. Page 286—The note at the bottom should have been omitted, it was added by Mr. Skinner when the article was published in his paper, and only shows he did not understand my reasoning.

Page 187, 2d col. 16 lines from the bottom, for "cannot punish crime;" read cannot *prevent* crime? Page 191, 2d col. 4th paragraph, for "have the kindness not to impute to me, "God is good is *because* he is good," for I believe I am "not justly." read have the goodness not to impute to me *that powerful argument*, "God is good because he is good," for I believe I am "not guilty." There were several more errours occurred but they are most of them easily discovered.

Br. Thomas Whittemore will accept our thanks for his liberty to publish his sermon on the Rich man and Lazarus, in the Gospel Advocate. I shall take the first opportunity to lay it before my readers. This is not the first favour I have received from the same quarter, and I can but regret my own poverty in every thing interesting puts it out of my power to make a return.

I need not say to my readers that I have not been very full in my religious notices. The reason I have not been more particular in re-

ticing the prosperity of our Zion is that I have not had room. I may say, however, our cause goes on well. Never better and better we can hardly ask. New England is constantly building meeting-houses, and her associations show that the time when universalism is to be trampled upon is nearly gone. In this state and west it goes well. Liberal sentiments spread rapidly—may virtue keep pace.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Editor.—Your review of my communications which were inserted in your Advocate, I have examined, and although I do not consider it to invalidate the arguments I have advanced, or to contain sufficient evidence to convince the unprejudiced, that my speculations are futile, or that your observations and reasonings, are congruous, scriptural and conclusive, yet it requires some notice; for I think your animadversions calculated to deceive, or produce "wrong" and unfavourable "impressions" concerning the import of my sentiments. You would make your readers believe that I have arrayed errour in a robe not her own; and in drawing the outlines of her features have attached more "beauty" to her person, than she doth "prossess." This may be true, abstractly considered. That "truth is far more lovely" in her appearance than falsehood, when they appear clad in their own garb, dressed in their own habiliments, and garnished with their own ornaments, is an incontrovertible fact. That errour, when exhibited in her own naked deformity, or beheld in her own costume, is a "haggard wretch," I would not dispute—and that, while thus viewed, she would receive the indignation and abhorrence she so richly merits, is almost a mathematical certainty. But observe, when endeavouring to allure and captivate those she would deceive, she assumes the name of Truth, covers her visage with a mask, and presents herself as an angel of light: and those who embrace her as worthy of their affection and love, are beguiled by her duplicity. To such she appears beautiful—to such she appears lovely. And, such is her power of deception, that she often betrays the votary of truth, and secures his attachment leaving her rival in the rear, forsaken by her friends. It is true, no man would harbour errour to the exclusion of truth, were he to discover their inherent properties, or to divest Errour of her gilded embroidery, gems and garlands with which she is decorated, when making her addresses. But here lies the difficulty. We do not always perceive her *seductive wiles*, nor distinguish her from her opponent, whose name and character she assumes.

You seem to rather gainsay my remarks concerning our fallibility, (though acknowledgeing they may be true,) stating, that "man is capable of ascertaining the truth, and of distinguishing it from errour." It seems somewhat singular whilst possessing this faculty, you did not discover whether my suggestions or observations were correct or not, and informed your readers accordingly; instead of alleging that they may be true, whilst considering them otherwise. Let your argument be reduced to form. "Truth is more admirable than errour. —The *fool* will choose the former in preference of the latter. Man is capable of perceiving truth, of distinguishing it from errour." He will therefore ascertain "what is truth," and according to his choice embrace it. How then doth it happen, that Errour gains so many proselytes, and secures so many votaries to her shrine? If man be capable of ascertaining truth, and he chooses this in preference to falsehood; why has the latter found an habitation in the mind of man? By what means has she been enabled to establish her kingdom in the earth? By what magick power does she sway her sceptre over the hearts of mankind? Will you say because man cannot come to the knowledge of the whole truth, by any powers which he does now possess, therefore concerning those things that come not within the jurisdiction of his critical inspection, he may imbibe erroneous opinions? Then you concede to my declarations. I acknowledge that man is endowed with faculties and powers, by which he is susceptible of improvement, through which medium he comes to the acquisition of knowledge and truth. But, I also contend, that he is subject to vanity, to delusion, to deception and guile. Such is the weakness of his perceptive organs or discriminating powers, that he is liable to draw false conclusions from premises he may establish, and by this means believe a lie and inculcate a falsehood. As respects those external surrounding objects presented to the mind, forming simple ideas, we may form some just conceptions concerning them, and ascertain a knowledge of their inherent properties and qualities, with but little danger of errour. So observation and experience also may bring us to a knowledge of some facts. But with regard to those things that are conveyed to the mind, by combining and abstracting these simples, forming another concatenation of ideas, (such is our imperfection,) we may, we are liable to err in our deductions and conclusions. Hence arises the possibility of our being mistaken concerning many propositions to which we yield our assent.

Your logical argumentation concerning the absurdity of laying aside the counsels of human reason in the determination of the truth of propositions presented to the mind for examination, is certainly rational and conclusive; and while considering your liberality, generosity and candour, I am convinced that instead of intentionally drawing some wrong inferences from my observations, you have misapprehended the substance of my arguments. Although I contend that man is a fallible being, and is liable

to be deceived, yet I would not deprive him of the exercise of reason, that noble faculty of the soul, which elevates him in the scale of creation, to the head of animated nature. It is rather my object to exhibit his weakness and imbecility, as well as strength and dignity—his means of improvement, and the powers of the understanding, as well as the necessity of being watchful and cautious in his pursuit after truth. Consider I argue, that as man is endowed with no innate principles, so his knowledge is dependant on the operation of the intellectual organs and reasoning faculties—that man is liable to be misled, and should therefore, be extremely cautious how he gives credence, or yields assent to any sentiment before mature reflection, candid investigation, and close inspection, shall warrant belief; and you will perceive, that instead of yielding up our argumentative powers to the dictates of "religionists," destroying our judgement, and ability to decide and determine what is right, I am giving them free exercise and liberty, to perform their functions, as well as paving a way to expand the intellect, and develope the understanding, by calling into operation the discriminating faculties of the mind.

You seem to scruple there being "any other source of knowledge than *nature*." We may express ourselves in a manner unintelligible to others, while conveying our ideas through the medium of such terms as are complex and susceptible of various definitions, for we may form different conceptions concerning their signification. Suppose that I admit that *nature* is the great reservoir of all knowledge. Now should I be desirous of obtaining a constant supply of its sacred treasure, and were under the absolute necessity of excavating a canal for the purpose of effecting my destined object; providing that a stream issuing from this fountain, flowed half the distance, would it not be advisable to cut the aqueduct to the rivulet, rather than to extend the same to the source. It is true it would be requisite for me to traverse the banks of the stream, in order to ascertain whether some other water was not amalgamated with it, corrupting the waters of knowledge. But notwithstanding, would not the expedient diminish the labour? The idea conveyed in this similitude you may say, corresponds with your argumentation. You say we must begin back, traverse the whole ground, find the true path, and walk in it as long as we can; alleging that the labour of others may lessen our own. This, in substance, is compatible with my reasoning or observations. Nature, I regard, as the constitution of things in their primitive state, before they are artificially decomposed, altered, or changed. Now should an individual endeavour to establish a system of ethics upon this foundation, discarding the speculations of others—should he endeavour to draw his knowledge from this source, rejecting the information of others, expecting there was so much "tare with the wheat," it would be easier raising a new crop, than to separate the wheat from the tare, he would be of but little service to himself, or usefulness to the world: for before he has arrived to much perfection, the angel death calls him home. He would be a fit subject to be placed back in the first rude and uncultivated ages of the world; for there he might devote his investigations to the benefit of the world. But in the present period he might waste away a useful life in this method of improvement, without arriving to the fullness of the station of his predecessors. I have not intimated we should regard as truth, what others have adopted as such, without evidence for confirmation. But what I wished to inculcate is, that some while viewing the corruptions and errours that exist in the world, (remember that we speak on metaphysical or theological subjects,) disregard what truths have been perceived, reject the theories that have been established, commence back, review the first condition of things, examine the laws of *nature*, and endeavour from them, to form a system that will conduct them to the temple of pure unadulterated knowledge; and that he who thus labours, considering the many difficulties that impede his progress, will toil in vain. But concerning *nature*, the only source of knowledge, I ask what is the difference between knowledge and information? I have received intelligence concerning the situation of England, and of the emancipation of the Catholicks: but am I entirely ignorant of the existing facts (if facts they may be called?) Have I no knowledge of these things? I have heard of the campaigns of Bonaparte and the military achievements of the brave Washington; and have I no knowledge concerning them? You may say they are only "conjectures" originating in testimony; but from whence cometh knowledge? How is it conveyed to the understanding? Is it not by "perception, experience and testimony," that we come to a knowledge of facts? All these are certain kinds of evidence by which we are made acquainted with things. And although experience and observation can be relied on with more safety than testimony, yet these witnesses are sometimes guilty of perjury. And should you say that the information of testimony is no other knowledge but conjecture, because testimony sometimes fails; I might say all knowledge is conjecture, because other evidence is sometimes false. Therefore if man possess knowledge, information must be a species of it. You say "*nature* could not originate the idea of a God in your mind, nor teach it." Have you any information of the existence of a God? Surely. How came you by this intelligence? Nature never taught it, and there is no other source of knowledge. How came you by this idea? You say revelation gave you the information. Here you make a

distinction between revelation and nature. I ask then, is revelation no source of knowledge? If not, (as you insinuate,) then as it is your object to learn wisdom, to improve the understanding, and to cultivate the vine of truth, lay the useless record on the bookcase to gather the dust that circulates in the atmosphere, and open the Volume of Nature, and from that extract the sweets with which you would feast the mind. You may declare that revelation is a description of the inherent properties of *nature;* but before you make this allegation, remember there is nothing *in* nature that could teach the existence of a God, yet you are taught there is such a being.

You doubt your having written any thing against the doctrine of imputed righteousness; but since you have stated your opinion concerning the sentiment in your reply, it will be unnecessary for me to refer you to those articles which warranted me to make this assertion.

You ridicule such rules of government as my speculations would form, and despise an earthly court which would be guilty of such principles of equity. Let us introduce your system of jurisprudence, and see which contains the most trifling absurdities. An assassin is arraigned before the bar for trial. He is accused of wilfully thrusting a dagger into the bosom of his companion. He acknowledges he has perpetrated the horrid deed, but as a reason why he should be justified by the Court, he pleads, "sin is the transgression of the law." Righteousness is obedience to the law. Now although I have previously broken the injunctions of the law, yet I am not now violating its requirements—I am not now transgressing its rules. Hence I am now just—I am now holy—I am now godly—I must therefore be acquitted, justified and released. The Judge seeing the weight of his defence justifies him in his sight and pronounces him blameless. "I know not by what rules the court of heaven is governed, but I believe every wise man would despise an earthly court guilty of such trifling." Here is a sinner; He has transgressed every moral obligation—he has bathed his hands in the blood of the defenceless victim of his rage—he has gratified every propensity, and satiated every lecherous desire—his life has been one continued exhibition of havock and blood;—all the evil which his corrupt heart could devise or his faculties execute has been the product of his will. By some cause he ceases for a period the prosecution of his pernicious designs. God pronounces him at once a just and good man, a righteous person. God does not inflict punishment prior to the commission of crime, for that would be inflicting punishment on the innocent. He does not chasten after the execution of the offence for that would be correcting the righteous, just and good. Therefore the malefactor must go unpunished, for it would be incongruous to punish him whom we have justified. These are the natural deductions drawn from your premises. "I dislike such trifling." "God will pronounce no man righteous" by the deeds of the law, for by them he is condemned. "He will pronounce no man" FULLY justified for his own works, for in them he is deficient.

You contend "there are no fictions, no accounting things that are not as though they were, except in reference to the end, God knowing, the means adopted will effect the purpose. Hence in reference to the end he may pronounce a man just when such is not the fact." *Now observe*, you remark all men shall become just through the means adopted. "The means are a belief in the life, preaching, suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ." Now observe, "faith is the evidence of things not seen," so after the dissolution of the body man is not in possession of this means of justifying righteousness. All men do not have faith—all do not believe—all do not become personally holy before death—all do not become righteous anterior to the termination of this mundane existence; the means of holiness extend not beyond this life. How then can all become just? Should you contend that all become holy at death or the resurrection, you will have the goodness to state, (since holiness signifies a salvation from sin when exhibited in the character of him who has been a sinner, and as no other name given whereby we can be saved but in and through Christ) by whom and by what means they are made holy. Again, "no man liveth and sinneth not; he that saith he is without sin is a liar and the truth abideth not in him." Therefore no man is holy, just and blameless, according to the requirements of the law, whilst on this terraqueous ball, yet some are proluted just, or in other words, are said to be justified. See Romans v. 1, 9, "Therefore *being* justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ;" "Much more then being *now* justified by his blood we shall be saved from wrath through him." This cannot be said in reference to the end seeing that the means adopted will make all men holy—for we see all do not become righteous through this medium, but it is spoken in reference to the justification which cometh by a belief in Jesus: "For he that believeth on him that justifieth the UNGODLY his faith is counted to him for righteousness."

You say the law to which Paul alludes in those passages I adduced, in favour of my arguments, has no relation to what we call good, but to the works enjoined by the Jewish ceremonial law. Please examine this more critically. By the deeds of the law there shall be no flesh *justified* in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Was there no knowledge of moral evil until posterior to the legislation of the ceremonial law? If so, then Adam, and

such as existed after until the days of Moses, were unconscious of having committed iniquity. But, in confutation of this sentiment *in Romans* v. 13 14. "For until the ceremonial law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression. But where there is no law there is no transgression."

Your quotations from the words of Jesus, John and James, may be easily reconciled to what I have said, by considering 1. That the scriptures are replete with exhortations, warning every man to turn unto the Lord who will have mercy, and to our God who will abundantly pardon. Or in the language of our Divine Master, be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect. 2. That the law demands perfect obedience to its restrictions, that Christ fulfilled the law by obsequious righteousness, and was justified by the law; and the nearer we approximate to his character, by assimilating to his likeness in doing that which is lawful and right; the nearer we become righteous according to the requisitions of the law, even as he was righteous. 3. That faith is not charity, or benevolence, hospitality, mercy and brotherly kindness; that therefore faith unaccompanied by good works is dead, or useless to society—that a man is pronounced righteous when he is comparatively godly, or characteristically holy without being perfect in holiness, as God is holy; that the law requires perfect obedience to its injunctions, which consists in practical righteousness; that therefore so far as an individual fulfils the law, so far he is justified by the law; that when he obeys one command, in that act he is righteous, and is justified by the law. That Abraham in offering up Isaac his well-beloved son, observed the divine requirements, and in that act was justified for obsequious righteousnes. 4. That inasmuch as all come short of the glory of God by wicked works, so it is evident that by the law no flesh can be justified in his sight, for their own works; and therefore it is requisite, that Christ's righteousness should be imputed unto them where they have come short of perfection that they may receive the justification of God. I say these things considered, will reconcile the seeming discrepency existing between the "scriptures you have quoted" and the doctrine I am advocating.

Let us regard then our own weakness, and look to "Jesus the authour and finisher of our faith" for sufficient righteousness (as the free gift of God) to justify us in his sight, that we may attribute due praise to him for the salvation that we obtain through his worthy name.

AMICUS.

Some remarks on the above may be expected in our next. In the mean time I wish our readers to remember it is their province to judge for themselves.—Ed.

I insert the following from Br. Kneeland. I make no comments. If I have erred by placing too much confidence in the Bible to please him, there are not wanting striplings enough in Israel or novices in theology to inform me I write more in the spirit and style of Hume, Paine, Volney, Bolingbroke and Voltaire, than in those of a Christian editor. It may be so.—But as I seem to have offended both believer and sceptick, advocated too much for the one and not enough for the other, I conclude I have taken about the right course.—Ed.

"I highly approve of the course you are pursuing, because it appears to be an honest as well as an independent one, though I do not think you are always correct, neither do I know what you mean by the infallibility of the scriptures, or how far you mean to extend that infallibility. That they contain much *errour*, as well as *truth*, even in relation to the character of God, there is not the shadow of doubt in my mind. The *facts* recorded in scripture, like all other facts of ancient date, rest on mere historical evidence. There *is* no other; there CAN BE no other evidence, unless God himself should make the record on imperishable materials, the autograph of which should remain to all futurity, to be equally examined by every generation. But let God *speak* in any way whatever; let him perform, or enable his creatures to perform, ever so many miracles, in proof that he did thus speak, and let *man* record his words, as well as the miracles, and what have *we*, after all, more than human testimony that God ever so spake, or that those miracles were ever performed? We must judge of every thing performed by man by the internal evidence which we possess, as to the probability or improbability of the truth of what is recorded. And whoever judges otherwise, to him there is nothing too absurd to be believed: and the greater the absurdity, the greater is the merit which is generally attached to a *blind* belief. It is time, high time, for people to open their eyes; I mean the eyes of their understanding, as well as their natural eyes; and they will find that "all is not gold that glistens."

FREE ENQUIRY.

The present is emphatically a time of enquiry. All sects and parties are on the alert. Many, ah! too many, with regret I say it, instead of asking what will meliorate the condition of man, are only intent upon those means which will best advance the interest of their party. Reader, are you a christian? Do you profess to belive that gospel which brings nothing but good news to the alienated and benighted family of man? Then you are no sectarian. Are you a Universalist? Do you take the bible as your only rule in matters of belief and practice? Do you view God as your friend, and the vast family of man as brethren who ought

not to deal treacherously with each other? If so, my sentiments correspond with yours. But I am no sectarian. I would be open to conviction, and ready to receive truth wherever found. Are you a Deist? Do you reject the truths of Christianity? Would you overthrow the Christian's hope of immortality? However much I may regret this, I would not deprive you of your rights of conscience, nor bar the door to enquiry, satisfied that if Christianity be true, she will suffer nothing by investigation. Are you engaged in meliorating the condition of men? Your object is then laudable: press onward, you will reap the reward of your labours. Are you an Atheist? Then you believe in no God but nature. But does Christianity require her votaries to deprive you of the privilege of expressing freely your honest convictions? No, for belief does not depend on the will, but on evidence. Hence, how absurd to censure each other for our honest convictions! We may reason against one's opinions, and censure the immoral conduct of all, of whatever sect or name under heaven, but must go no farther.

I care not to what sect man belongs; he is a being fond of power, fond of extending his influence over the minds of his fellow men.—Charming as may be the sound of Universalism to my ear, yet well I know that many are inclined to declaim against a brother, merely because he happens to differ in opinion, and shut his mouth by mere declamation. But it may be said too much freedom will be equally pernicious as the opposite extreme. Facts speak a different language. Cast your eye back to the dark ages, see mankind enveloped in midnight darkness, and, if possible, their practice darker still. Come down to the present day, and tell me if the present condition of man be more deplorable than it was one thousand years ago? Is the present spirit of enquiry calculated to degrade the dignity of man, destroy his sense of moral accountability, and spread strife and enmity among the human race? If so, stay her progress—if not, encourage her. What will be the consequence of calm, sober and candid investigation? Truth will come forth, as from a furnace, purified with fire. Then, what need of alarm? Truth ever has had, and ever will have, a salutary influence on the human mind. It softens the heart, removes bigotry and superstition, and renders it more feelingly alive to the misfortunes of men. Is this prejudicial to the best interest of society? I leave every one to determine.

I would declaim against *immorality*, but I would not stay the progress of free enquiry. No, if truth cannot prevent the triumph of errour, she is not worth possessing. If I cannot maintain my opinions, and bring convincing evidence of their correctness, I will immediately abandon them. You need not tell me that man, when enlightened, chooses errour in preference to truth. Every one loves truth. Only present her with all her native loveliness—convince man that it is for his greatest good to embrace her—he immediately grasps her as his greatest and his loveliest friend. But what is truth? It is that which agrees with facts, and cannot be overthrown. No sophistry can alter her, no ingenuity change her natures.

Will not the vast difference I find between truth and my former opinions lead me into sceptical indifference? Certainly not—far otherwise. I once believed sentiments which, to doubt of their truth or to attempt to prove them true, was to annihilate them. Such were "total depravity," "infinity of sin," "election and reprobation," "imputed righteousness," "vicarious atonement," "trinity," and "the endless misery of the wicked," etc. To sentiments like these, no enlightened mind can assent. Many may ignorantly assent to them; others captivated by "the wisdom of this world," may readily acquiesce in the opinions of the popular and the powerful. But whether candid investigation, or ignorant credulity and popular acquiescence, be the more likely to produce sceptical indifference, I leave the judicious to determine.

I am a reasonable being, and as such am bound to exercise my reasoning faculties. If not, why were they bestowed? Would an infinitely wise Being give me powers never to be exerted? Would he bless me with intelligence for no purpose? Away with the thought; it is too degrading to human nature, and dishonourable to God! But, one may say, "you are a poor fallible being! Dare you oppose the will of heaven, and bid defiance to those who are so anxious for your souls salvation." No, I would not oppose the will of heaven. But when the wisdom of man forms a creed and tells me I must believe it, I beg leave to ask whether its doctrines are consistent with reason or contrary to it. And, so far as I am blessed with intellectual powers, if I enlist them in the cause of truth, I shall be successful in discovering her.

Few are blessed with the acuteness of a Newton or of a Locke; but fewer still have honesty and independence enough to avow their honest conviction. So close has the priest drawn the cords which bind the mind, that man dare not think. Should one question the truth of what he asserts, he immediately tells him of an "angry God," and an "endless hell." I would reason candidly on the subject, and search for truth as for hidden treasures. What! Dare you trust your "carnal reason," you may be deceived. "God's ways are not as our ways." Very well, admit it.—What then. Does it follow that I am incapable of discriminating between truth and falsehood? I think not, and may I never distrust those faculties bestowed by my heavenly Crea-

tor, so much as to refuse their aid in the discovery of truth.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good," is the voice of reason, of nature, and of revelation. Reason speaks as with a voice of thunder, assent to nothing but upon a conviction of its truth. Not only nature echoes the same, but revelation enforces it—invites the most severe scrutiny, and recommends herself to our confidence, by assuring us that whatever is contrary to reason is not from God. Paul "reasoned with them out of the Scriptures."—Acts xvii. 2. Jesus was heard to reason with the Sadducees.—Mark xii. 28.—Paul said, "Prove your ownselves.—II. Cor. xiii. 5. "Let every man prove his own work." Eph. vi. 4. "We have before proved," etc. Rom. iii. 9. Paul and Barnabus reasoned; "the contention grew so sharp between them, that they departed asunder, one from the other."—Acts xv. 39. If this be true, if we may rely on these declarations and trust to the voice of heaven, where now ye anathematizers of human reason, where your example for tame submission to the priest? Hushed in oblivion! sunk to everlasting night! You would fain stifle the active and enquiring mind, and lull the mental powers to sleep. You would convert that religion into a curse, which was designed to bless, delight, and cheer the abodes of men. You, who would fain dictate in matters of belief, have done more to strengthen the hands of infidelity, than Mahometans, Pagans and Jews. Yes, and not satisfied with your "eternity of hell-torments," you would create a present hell, and yourselves act as officiating demons! You would separate the "elected few" from the reprobate multitude, to enjoy the good of the land, and consign to the inquisition all who dared to differ from you in opinion. You need not longer heap your reproachful epithets on an intelligent community, for they have lost their power to charm or to frighten. Why need I care for the name my enemies choose to give me. Infidel, Deist, Atheist, Universalist, and Heretick, are all the same to me, if determined to embrace truth wherever she presents herself.

America is destined to be free. She has yet to learn, that while her patriotick sons are in mental slavery, there is room for improvement—that the mind cannot be bound and the body free. Philanthropists, Christians, and Patriots, sleep no longer. The spirit of enquiry is abroad, and she will march onward till every one shall feel the influence of that "grace which bringeth salvation to all men." I hail as friends to the human race, all who are labouring to unite mankind in the bonds of peace and friendship. May they prevail, and man once feel and know himself to be free—free from priestly tyranny—free from false fears—free from that unbelief which causes him to look on God as his enemy.

When this shall be accomplished, the religion of Jesus will emancipate the vast family of man. Then will its benign influence soften every heart. Then will men greet each other as brethren, and view God as a Universal Parent. This time will come. It has been foretold by the Prophets, and confirmed by Jesus himself. Orthodoxy may exert her powers to the utmost. Heterodoxy may use her mighty influence. Infidelity may stalk fearlessly at noon-day. The coercive arm of the magistrate may protect the one and crush the other, yet the "gates of hell" cannot prevail against it.

I may never live to see it. But with an eye of faith, I look forward to the time when the capacious mind of man will embrace "friend, parents, neighbour, his country next, and next the human race." Ah! happy time. Methinks I see in prospective, the time when the wolf and the lamb shall lie down together, and all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest. Then no one shall have occasion to say to his neighbour, "Know ye the Lord." And then will the object be accomplished for which Christ laboured, and died. May knowledge increase, free enquiry be encouraged, till it regenerate and harmonize the vast family of man. PHILANTHROPE.

LONG PRAYERS.

Mr. Editor:—There is one thing among the clergy of all denominations I do not like. There may be more than one, but there is one in particular. I refer to long prayers and also to sermonizing in prayer. I know not what your sentiments may be on this subject nor do I care. But it is to me absolutely disgusting to hear a puny worm get up in the sanctuary and with pomposity enough to shame Lucifer himself, spread forth his hands and in an affected and highly strained tone of voice tell the Deity how big he is and how much he knows and how good he is, how much better he is than men are, and how much condescension he manifests, to allow us to take his name in our lips, &c.

I heard my friend Dogmaticus the other day, get into the pulpit to pray, and I will assure your, Mr. Editor, I highly esteem Dogmaticus, he has a fine voice, a rich imagination and an enviable flow of words, I say I heard him attempt to pray. He told God how extensive was the Divinity, how long Deity had existed and how long he would exist, how much wisdom he displayed in arranging the universe and how much goodness in creating man, how much mercy in redeeming, &c. He then run over the great points of theology and gave us a full body of Divinity, not quite as long as Gill's nor quite so metaphysical as Dr. Hokkin's; but as unintelligible as either. When he had done "what a prayer!" dozens exclaimed, while I for myself was obliged to reply, if

a man should have talked so to me in my house I would have kicked him out of doors.

Mr. Editor, I am willing every man should pray. But I cannot submit to hear Deity so mocked and for my life of me when I have listened to one of these *rants*, I can only say ye have made your heavenly Father appear a pretty clever fellow.

I never pray myself, for I think God knows better what is for my good than I do myself, and I have no doubt that he will give me all that will redound to my benefit. Others think differently. Let them pray, but let them be decent. If they have any thing to ask let them do it in a plain and humble manner, with the consciousness they are in the presence of the Majesty of the Universe. SENEX.

ON SLAVERY.

Perhaps there is no subject on which the mind of man contemplates, with deeper regret, or which it beholds with greater detestation than the enslaving of the human species.—Often have my ears been saluted with the groans of oppression, and my heart pained with the bitter reflection, that mankind are prone to tyranny and usurpation. Whilst one nation exhibits the strongest features of cruelty and an unfeeling disposition to tyrannize, by unwarranted deprivation of bodily exercise and temporal wants, another manifests the same spirit by attempting to stifle investigation and check the progress of truth—destroying all happiness which arises from the free exercise of the mental faculties and the discovery of important truths.

I have been led to reflect more particularly on this subject, by reason of the recent disclosures exhibited in the late attempts of aspiring bigots to prostrate our liberties, and consign them to the merciless shades of religious despotism. In the discussion of this subject, two particulars deserve notice. First, does our government grant "equal rights" to all? The affirmative must be the universal answer.—Secondly, do the people of the United States *enjoy* these rights and privileges? To which I answer in the negative, and offer the proof.

Our constitution expressly declares that "all men are created free and equal," which implies that equal rights should be secured to all, regardless of religious opinions, and that neither belief nor profession, but intrinsick worth and merit should be the only necessary qualifications to raise men to elevated situations.—Now it is obvious that where profession and not principle, belief and not virtue, is made the test of a man's character, the object of our constitution is defeated, the rights of the people violated, and the privileges of individuals proscribed.

Dr. Ely would proscribe all who do not profess to believe in the Deity of Jesus of Nazareth; and Josiah Bissell, jr. all who do not believe (or profess to) that "Sabbath-breaking is worse than murder;" and some of our courts have rejected important witnesses because they either believed too much or not quite enough—because they either disbelieved the eternity of hell-torments, or the omniscience of the Devil, notwithstanding their moral characters were irreproachable.

If this is not slavery, it must be its image; for surely dictation, compulsion, and proscription, form no part of a freeman's creed, and those who live under their influence, do and must suffer their consequences.

All who have the least acquaintance with mankind, cannot but admit that a majority of men have in all ages been slaves—slaves to vicious habits or evil desires, to superstition or bigotry, to riches or pleasure, to priestly tyranny or relentless zeal. Who has not seen men, yes men in this boasted land of freedom, awed into the most servile compliance, the most degrading subjection, by the false glare of popularity, that empty echo of renown, based on ignorance and stupidity? Who is so blind as not to perceive the effect the movements of the Orthodox are designed to have on community, by confining all business of profit to those of their belief? What liberal Christian does not here feel the weight of oppression, and see the effect their theory has on their practice? Who does not perceive that this is an unwarranted encroachment on the rights and consciencies of men? Is this consistent with the constitution of our land? with that gospel which enjoins us to love our enemies, and to do good unto all as we have opportunity, that we may "be perfect even as our Father in heaven is perfect?" Oh that men would act agreeable to the dictates of reason, and the gospel of our Saviour, and would remember that love cannot be the offspring of hatred, nor morality of depravity, for "every tree is known by its fruit."

That superstition subjects men to slavery, the history of past ages sufficiently proves.—Read the history of Nebuchadnezzar. He made an image and commanded that all should fall down and worship it, under the penalty of being cast into the fiery furnace. Now, did all worship? yes, or professed to, save three. Were not these men slaves to the violence and tyranny of their king? Compare this with the furnace of Orthodoxy, it is no more than a vapour. Compare Nebuchadnezzar with their God, and ask yourself which is the most lovely. Orthodoxy has erected a furnace, imagined a character which she worships, far more despotick and cruel to execute an unsatisfied malignity on all who do not fall down and worship, at the shrine of her idolatry, the image of her infatuation. What proportion of mankind does not this embrace! How few but are slaves to fear. "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear

hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love. We love him because he first loved us."—1 John, iv. 18, 19. C. H.

REV. ABNER KNEELAND.

The following is the letter of Mr. Kneeland, mentioned in our last, which we are willing to have speak for itself. And instead of reiterating the charge of *Atheism* or *Materialism* against Br. Kneeland, in face of his plain declarations, under his own hand, "as the manner of some is," we shall content ourselves with believing them, and rejoicing that the charge is not true.—*R. Inq.*

From the N. Y. Gospel Herald.

Mr. Editor.—As you have published certain resolutions in your last number, in which my name is used, and which, remaining uncontradicted, would be calculated to injure my public character, I wish to be permitted to communicate to the public, through the same medium, the following statements of facts, viz:

1. I have ever believed, since I arrived to years of discretion, and do now believe in the existence of One Supreme Intelligence—a being of infinite wisdom, power and goodness; and have never said, either publicly or privately, to my knowledge or belief, any thing that even implied to the contrary: nor am I aware of having said any thing which could *consistently* be so construed.

2. I have used the best arguments of which I am capable, after reading most, if not all the best writers on the subject of the resurrection; and, at the same time, candidly stating the objections, or at least some of them, which might be, and even are, raised against it; and I have not been aware that the objections outweighed the arguments; but have ever supposed that the arguments preponderated in favor of the truth of the doctrine in question. But, if it is otherwise, it is not my fault; it must be because either the facts are not true on which the doctrine in question is built, or else they have become so obscure, through the lapse of time, that they cannot *now* be very well substantiated.

3. As to the "authenticity of the Bible," I candidly acknowledge that, with Dr. Lardner and others, some of the most learned men who have written on the subject, I doubt the authenticity of some books; I admit the possibility, and even probability, of interpolation in others; and hold that each and every individual has an undoubted right to read, construe, and understand the Scriptures for himself; and that their is no authority to call any one to an account for so doing.——Hear both sides, and then judge. ABNER KNEELAND.

New-York, March 2, 1829.

As to the resurrection of Christ Mr. Kneeland also states in a communication to the "*Trumpet*"

That it "*must* have been true" that the belief of the primitive Christians therein, was founded on *fact*; and while he joyfully embraces all the evidence of the resurrection, which is found in the New Testament, he thinks he sees still stronger evidence of it in the circumstance, that churches were formed professing this belief, immediately after the event is said to have taken place.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY.

That part of what is termed the Mississippi Valley, which lies within the limits of the U. States, contains, says Mr. Darby, 1,099,000 square miles. The great central valley of the U. States may be divided into five sections, the fourth one of which is the great plain of the Mississippi Valley, commencing at the foot of the Alleghany mountain, and extending west fifteen hundred miles, to the Sand Plain, and from the valley of the northern lakes to the mouth of the Ohio; a distance of six hundred miles. The states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, parts of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Michigan; together with the region comprising the territories lying west of the States, compose this valley. This plain is a secondary formation, resting on horizontal limestone rock, embedding large quantities of shells. It is rich in agricultural and mineral resources. Its bed, says the A. Q. Review, which is 1500 by 900 miles in extent would cover half of Europe.—Iron ore abounds generally. In Missouri there is a mass of this ore, forming a hill of 500 feet in height, and five miles in extent, which yields 75 per cent iron. The lead mines of Missouri and Illinois would cover about 200 square miles, and are supposed to be the richest mines of that metal on the globe. Twelve million of pounds were melted in 1828, and it is supposed they will furnish twenty millions during the present year. Salt water is found over the whole extent of this region. Gypsum and saltpeter, together with many of the clays and earths that are used in the arts are abundant. "Here indeed will every rood support its man; for of such a region, without barren heath, mountain waste, or slope, and where all is fertile and healthful; where no timber lands need be left for fuel; with mineral resources enough to stimulate all the arts, and contribute to all wants—who can say what is the limit of its future population? Europe could seat all her nations comfortably upon this plain."

Rev. Mr. Edmands, Pastor of a Universalist Church in London, is at present preaching to the society in Glasgow, (Scotland,) which has lately been deprived of its pastor, in the death of Rev. William Worral.

Married—In Scipio, on the 18th instant, by Rev. O. A. Brownson, Mr. John Van Deusen to Miss Betsey Ann Alward, both of Scipio.

Extract from the Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois.—Copied from the Illinois Republican.

THURSDAY, Dec. 11th, 1828.—The bill for "An act for the prevention of vice and immorality," was read a second time, when Mr. Jones offered the following amendment to said bill, viz: "That if any person, on the Sabbath or first day of the week, shall attempt to disturb the peace or good order of any body of people, gathered together for the purpose of worshipping Almighty God, by offering to sell pamphlets or books, of any description whatever, or begging money, or any other thing for the support of Missionary Societies, Bible Societies, or Sunday Schools, they shall be fined in any sum not more than fifteen dollars, nor less than five dollars."

This Mr. Jones, for aught we see, has hit the nail on the head. He certainly has as good a right to ask for a *law* to protect *his* conscience as any body else,—and we cannot conceive how the legislature can withhold the same privilege from him, after they have assumed the principle of granting protection to others. His conscience may be as much disturbed by the above-named *offences*, as the consciences of our "pious ancestors" were, by the notes of the organ, and as those of our *pious* cotemporaries appear to be, by the rumbling of a mail coach. —*Ed. Inq.*

A Main paper proposes the following:

QUESTION.

If the civil government have a right to compel people to rest on the christian Sabbath, because the *divine* Law requires them to do so, have they not an equal right to compel them to work the other six days, since this is as much made their duty by the same Law?

Dr. Mitchel, has already decided this question in the affirmative.

The minutes and proceedings of the Black River association of Universalists were not received in season for this number. The Amended Constitution is received, but it is thought best to publish the whole together.

The Rev. L. S. Everett, former Editor of this paper, was installed on the 4th inst. over the first Universalist Society and Church in Charlestown, Mass. May this connection be long and useful, abundantly blessed to both Pastor and Society.

Poetick Department.

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

Substance of a short discourse occasioned by a visit from a pious gentleman of the orthodox cast, during my severe illness.

PRIEST.

There seems yet a step between you and the grave,
Have you faith in redemption which only can save,
From the dangers awaiting the poor sinner there,
Cast out from all bliss into endless despair,
In the kingdom of sorrows forever to dwell
And swim in the lava of the nethermost hell?

REPLY.

Most hard is the fate of our frail human race
If this kingdom be known in God's plan of free grace,
If a kingdom of torments be ordain'd to stand;
Then God the Supreme should resign his command
To worlds he has fashion'd and systems ordained,
And the Saviour, you speak of, no more should be nam'd.

PRIEST.

There are evils in nature we've cause to deplore,
Why may they not last after time is no more?
O'er the storm-beaten landscape how cheerless the gale
Where late flow'd the song of the sweet nightingale!
Where the myrtle and rose and the gay lily grew
Emitting their sweets and their beauties to view,
Pleasures of spring are from our latitude hurl'd
The ravage of winter spreads over the world;
The Sun late in splendour gave birth to the morn
And nature rejoic'd in the life-giving dawn.
But now all is darkness and gone is the ray,
And night treads the path of the quick flying daw.
So man in vain glory aspires to arise
And vie with the sun in his blaze thro' the skies,
But falls and death's pillow is hard to his head
Without a known Saviour to soften his bed.

REPLY.

Mourn over the darkness of night as we may
The sun will return and again bless the day,
Though o'er the wide wastes of winter we sigh,
The seasons, obeying their law from on high
Through ages revolve to their change ever true,
And ever the blessings of May will renew.
And is there no sun to dispell the drear gloom
The night so depressive that hangs o'er the tomb?
From death's cold embrace is there none that can save
"And light up a smile" on the night of the grave?
Great Authour of Life! Thou unknown sea of Love!
Thy wish is thy law thro' the armies above;
What wisdom devis'd, Love in joy bade it be
And death's darkest shades are submissive to thee.
Thine Almighty arm met with none to oppose
When chaos gave way and creation arose—
When systems o'er systems appeared at thy call
Thine Omniscient mandate gave law to them all;
When worlds on thy fingers were balanced in air,
Lo! varying millions rejoiced in thy care.
O soon shall thy love lead us all to rejoice,
When priest-craft and errour ashamed of their voice,
Agreements with hell and with death, thy rude foes!
By thee sent to darkness from which they arose—
When orthodox tumults and conflicts shall cease
When discord shall smile at the whispers of peace,
When death in destruction shall own thy ways just
And all opposition shall crumble to dust—
Stars no longer weeping, with rapture will glow
Nor man longer turn pale at tidings of woe
When *Christ* the Saviour who lives tho' he was dead,
Shall light, love and life thro' immensity shed—
His face the dark realms of the grave will illume
And light the glad smile "on the night of the tomb."
The sorrow that o'er the frail sinner's urn plays
Will all be absorb'd in a flood of free grace;
Our Infinite SUN will give infinite light
And space will be pleas'd with the absence of night—
Then order again will pervade the vast whole
And eternity's wave will in happiness roll.

JEWETT.

☞*The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N.Y. SATURDAY, JULY 11, 1829. [NO. 14.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

BY MENZIES RAYNER.

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.—Matthew xxv. 46.

In our last discourse upon this subject, a particular illustration was given of the meaning of the declaration concerning the coming of the Son of man with his holy angels, as described in the context. Some notice was also taken of the *separation* which it is said should then take place. It was remarked that they were *nations*, and not *individuals*, which were then to be separated. Before him shall be gathered all *nations*, and he shall separate *them*, that is, the *nations*. The Greek pronoun *autous*, translated *them*, refers to the Greek noun *ethne*, rendered nations, as its antecedent, and agrees with it; and there is no other antecedent to which it can refer. If it be objected, by the classical critick that autous is in the *masculine*, and ethne in the *neuter* gender, the objection is removed, when it is considered that this mode of grammatical construction is common in Greek, and consistent with the idiom of that language. As for instance, in the 2d chapter of Rev. 26th and 27th verses. "And he that overcometh and keepeth my words unto the end, to him will I give power over the *nations*, and he shall rule *them* with a rod of iron."—Here the same original words are used as in the passage on which we are now commenting, and made to agree with each other, as no one will question, although one is in the *masculine*, and the other in the *neuter* gender.

This then being the plain and necessary construction of the passage, the impropriety of considering it a representation of the proceedings of a future general judgement after death, must be obvious. It has never, I believe, been supposed that the different *nations* of the earth will then be separated; or that the human race shall then be placed on the right hand, or on the left of the judge, according to their *national* character, or according as it shall be determined whether they had been born and educated in *one country* or in *another*. "God, (we are told) has made of one blood, *all nations* of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath *determined* the times *before appointed*, and the *bounds* of their habitation." It cannot therefore be imagined that any will be condemned to stand on the *left* hand, on account of such determination and appointment of their habitation upon earth. Admitting therefore, (what cannot consistently be denied,) that they are *nations*, which it is said should be separated, this circumstance is another forcible objection to the commonly received opinion, that it is a general judgement, in a future state, which is described in the passage. The being placed on the right hand and on the left, are figurative terms: and in this parable denote favour, distinction, and happiness to the former, and degradation and misery to the latter. And accordingly the sentence proceeds: "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." According to the view we have taken of the passage, the kingdom here mentioned, into which those on the right hand were to enter is the kingdom of Christ upon earth,—the gospel kingdom. And well might those be pronounced blessed, who should enter into this kingdom, and enjoy its inestimable privileges, and hopes of immortality. This is that kingdom of the gospel, which was to be preached among all nations for a witness: the kingdom of *God* which our Saviour declared was nigh at hand, which some then living should see come with power, before they should taste of death. This is that inheritance of the saints in light, for which St. Paul exhorts christians to give thanks to the Father: who (saith he,) hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son."

And this kingdom of gospel grace and salvation was *prepared*, that is, *designed* and *determined* in the purpose of God, from the foundation of the world. Hence again, the Apostle to the Ephesians says, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as he hath chosen in him before the foundation of the world; that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will; in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." And then,

lest it should be supposed that this gospel kingdom or dispensation, consisting in this adoption,—these spiritual blessings, according to the riches of grace, prepared, designed, and determined before the foundation of the world, were limited to a certain number; or were to comprehend only a *part* of the human race, the Apostle goes on to show that ultimately all mankind should be gathered into this kingdom—be embraced in this reign of gospel grace; and blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ. Hence he says, "having made known unto us, (to us first) the mystery of his own will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself;" (mark the Apostles description of this good pleasure of God, which he purposed in himself.) "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, *all things*, in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him; in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purposes of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

Although the gospel kingdom of grace, mercy, and eternal life was prepared from the foundation of the world in the good pleasure and purpose of God, yet its blessedness can be known and enjoyed only by those to whom it is revealed,—who believe in and embrace it.—Such are the truly blessed who inherit the kingdom; enjoy its inestimable privileges, and its glorious prospects.

It will be seen that we consider those in the parable, said to be placed on the *right* hand of the king, as meaning those who in this time of separation should be found submitting to the reign of the Messiah, who is emphatically *King in Zion;* and consequently *king* of all in every age, who hear and receive the gospel. So that those who are still afar off,—either altogether ignorant of Christ and his gospel, or who, like the Jewish nation, obstinately reject them, may, and *shall*, yet be brought nigh, by the blood of Christ—be "delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son," "where grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life."

The *cause* assigned in the parable, for this gracious sentence, will not be considered until we have noticed the tremendous sentence pronounced on those on the *left* hand, which is as follows: "Then shall he (namely the king,) say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." I need not tell you that this sentence has been the subject of the most frightful representations of what it is confidently asserted, (and sometimes with apparent exultation,) will be exhibited at the general judgement. It has been dwelt upon, amplified, an urged, with all the powers of eloquence. The judge has been represented as turning his angry countenance upon the world of reprobate wretches on his left hand, and pronouncing in a voice which shall rend the heavens; and with the breath of wrath which shall perpetuate the flames of hell forever,—"*Depart ye cursed.*"

But why this angry countenance in him that sitteth on the throne? Why this supposed rage and indignation, at this grand consummation of human affairs? Has any thing unforeseen, or unexpected occurred? Have any of his creatures, (with reverence let it be said,) have any of his creatures injured, or disappointed him, or frustrated any of his purposes, No. This can never have happened. Why then is the judge angry? Why flashes the dread lightning in his countenance? Why is he filled with hatred, revenge and rage towards his helpless offspring? He is *not;* he *never* was; he *never can* be a being subject to human passions; and any expressions in the Bible which seem to indicate such passions or emotions in the Supreme Being, are the language of accommodation and of metaphor.

How then are we to understand the sentence; depart from me ye cursed? &c. Its application to the *Jewish* nation is obvious, and fully accords, not only with the other parts of our Saviour's discourse on this occasion, as we have before noticed; but also with many other prophetic descriptions, and figurative representations, which evidently allude to the same people, and the same events. Moses prophetically declares to the Jewish nation, the evils and curses which should come upon them for their disobedience and rebellion. "If thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to do his commandments, &c. all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee. Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field—the Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke,—until thou be destroyed." "The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies. Thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them; and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth." And now mark, I beseech you, (for I cannot refrain from quoting this prophecy still further,) mark, in describing these curses and calamities, how particularly he points out the siege and desolation of Jerusalem. "The Lord shall bring a nation upon thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the *Eagle* flieth: a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand: a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor shew favour to the young. He shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down. And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters, in the siege, and in the straitness wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee. The tender and delicate woman among you, which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicate-

ness and tenderness; her eye shall be evil toward the husband of her bosom, and toward her son, and toward her daughter, and toward her young one,—and toward her children which she shall bear; for she shall eat them for want of all things, secretly, in the siege and straitness wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates." This last, most revolting circumstance, the Jewish historian particularly mentions as having literally taken place at the siege of Jerusalem.

I have given this long quotation, because it so particularly describes in the prophetick language of Moses, the *curses*,—that is, the troubles and calamities, which in after time, would come upon the Jewish nation. But the calamities threatened are all confined to this life, without the least intimation of any evils beyond it. Is it then to be wondered, that in reference to the same people, and the same events, the judge, in the prophetick language of the parable under consideration, should be represented as using the language—Depart from me ye *cursed?* Our Saviour in several other places, employs in substance, the same language, when it is evident the Jewish people only are referred to. As for instance, in the 13th of Luke, "When once the master of the house is risen up, and ye begin to stand without and to knock, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us, and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are,—*depart* from me, all ye workers of iniquity; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and yourselves thrust out." But they are commanded to depart into *everlasting fire.* Few will contend that this is to be taken literally, for what effect can *material* fire be supposed to have upon an *immortal* spirit, or an *incorruptible* body? Fire is employed as a figure to denote temporal afflictions and calamities. The Psalmist says, "Thou O God hast proved us, thou hast tried us as silver is tried; thou layest affliction upon our loins: we went through *fire*, and through water." Again: "The Lord was wroth; so a *fire* was kindled against Jacob, and anger also came up against Israel."

In the parable of the wheat and the tares, which evidently in its meaning and application is parallel with this of the sheep and the goats, it is said in the conclusion, "The Son of man shall send forth his Angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire," alluding to the calamities which would be sent upon the Jewish nation from the Lord of Hosts; "whose fire, (says the prophet,) is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem." The meaning of the term *everlasting*, will be enquired into in the particular consideration of the text, to which we have not yet arrived.

But it is declared that this everlasting fire, was prepared for the *devil* and his *angels*.—You well know, my hearers, what has been the common tradition upon this subject; namely, that at a certain period, not precisely ascertained, a part of the holy angels in heaven, (the number also undefined,) became dissatisfied with their situation, and "*self-tempted*," revolted from their allegiance to their Maker,—rose in opposition to their sovereign,—fomented horrid rebellion; and then, to use a military phrase, "came on the tug of war." The consequence of which was, the rebel host was discomfited, subdued, and chained; and then cast into this *everlasting fire* prepared for them. If concerning so sacred a subject, *curiosity* was allowable the enquiry might arise, *when* was this everlasting fire prepared? Was it a part of the *original* plan of the Creator? Or was it left to be furnished as contingent exigences might require? The latter supposition would be an impeachment of the divine counsels, and a denial of the infinite prescience of the Deity.—The former represents him as creating legions of angels, and placing them near to himself in a state of holiness and happiness; but having previously prepared for them a hell of fire and brimstone, which he foresaw before he created them must be their ultimate destiny, and their everlasting habitation! My brethren, I know of no language capable of expressing an idea so horrid as this. And yet this is the more rational supposition of the two; for to deny the unqualified foreknowledge of God, amounts very nearly to a denial of his existence; and to suppose that he has not provided for every known event, is absurd. But furthermore, admitting this everlasting fire to be in another world, and that it was prepared for the devil and his angels, or for the *fallen* angels, as has been generally supposed, how shall we account for its becoming the receptacle, or the place of punishment, for the human race, contrary to its original designation? It seems that no fiery hell, no place or state of future torment was originally provided, or contemplated for mankind.—They were a race of beings made according to the primmer, to glorify God, and enjoy him forever, as their chief end. But in process of time, a fatal and unexpected catastrophe happened, for which no provision had been made. Man was found to be a frail and erring creature subject to vanity. He becomes a transgressor, a sinner, and must be eternally punished; and for this no calculation has been made! No hell—no everlasting fire has been prepared for him! (Orthodoxy would not have made such a mistake as this in their provision for *hereticks.*) What now must be done? Why, there is fortunately, an expedient, unthought of before, but which will answer every purpose; let him and millions of his unborn posterity be sent to the abode of those former rebels, the devil and his angels, those high-born sons of light, for

whom alone that habitation was originally prepared! My brethren, I would not willingly treat a serious subject with any degree of lightness; but although the above theological opinion, has had the sanction of long tradition, and the popular veneration of ages, I can scarcely allow it to be a serious one; because I am convinced it is not founded either in reason or scripture, but in the *perversion* of both. Who can for a moment harbour the monstrous idea, that a great part of the human race are finally to be sent to a place of everlasting misery, contrary to the original purpose and design of their Creator; and without his foreknowledge also, unless we can believe it possible for him to know that an event will take place *contrary* to his intention.—Everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. Dr. Adam Clark in his commentary has the following remark upon the passage.—"The devil and his angels sinned before the creation of the world; and the place of torment was *then* prepared for *them*." He does not tell us from whence he derived this knowledge; the scriptures give no account of the angels sinning before the creation of this world, or that the place of torment was *then* prepared for them, or that there was any sin or misery before that period. Indeed the angels *here* alluded to, it is believed, had no existence before the creation of this world. But the commentator proceeds and says, "*It never was designed for* HUMAN SOULS." Now, what is the unavoidable inference from this? It is one of these two things; either that God will never send any human souls to that place of torment, or, else, he will do that which he never designed to do! Such are some of the absurdities which are necessarily involved in the doctrine of endless punishment in a future state.

The word *devil*, which comes from the Greek word diabolos, although it has several different applications in scripture, most literally means a *calumniator*, or *accuser;* as the word *satan* signifies an *adversary*. And they both apply with great propriety to the Jews in the days of our Saviour, and especially to the chief priests and rulers; who were constantly the calumniators, accusers, and adversaries of our Saviour; and may therefore, by an appropriate figure of speech be called the devil and his angels; because those rulers, and others instigated by them, were continually accusing and persecuting Christ; contemning his mission, and opposing his doctrine.

As it must be allowed that this whole discourse of our Saviour has a particular reference to the calamities which were coming upon the Jews—the destruction of their city and temple—the slaughter of the inhabitants—the subversion of their polity—and their subsequent dispersion and troubles: so here in *this* parable of the sheep and the goats, as in all others, the main and evident object of the symbolick illustration is principally to be considered, whilst the minor parts, or exteriour appendages of the parable should not be too particularly or rigidly regarded. The main object of this parable as well as of the discourse, and of the other parables which precede it, evidently was to warn the disciples of the approaching calamities above mentioned, as well as to describe the blessedness of the gospel dispensation; and therefore, I think it very reasonable to understand the strong language, and the bold figures employed in the sentence under consideration; "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," &c. as alluding to, and descriptive of the same calamities; which in the counsels and providence of God, were prepared, figuratively speaking, for the devil and his angels; that is, for the Jewish rulers and people, the accusers, adversaries, and opposers of our Saviour and his gospel.

We come now to notice the reasons, as stated in the parable, for the two different sentences pronounced by the judge, upon those on either hand. And the reasons assigned are such as must, we think, confirm the truth of the opinion that it is not a future general judgement after death, nor the eternal destinies of men in another world, which are here represented.—Take notice then, my hearers, when those on the right hand are pronounced *blessed*, and are called to inherit the kingdom, &c. What is the *reason* given for this gracious sentence? It is as follows, "for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink &c." This the disciples of our Saviour did; they followed him, and they ministered unto him; and those who had not this opportunity, and yet did the same acts of kindness and hospitality to others, the judge declares he accepted, as if done to himself. But are these acts of charity, which are no more than every man's duty, to *merit* an eternal reward? If so, eternal life, instead of a free gift, may be claimed as a *debt;* and salvation is not of grace but of *works*. But this the Apostle utterly denies.—Good works are indeed profitable unto men, in this world, and they have their proper reward closely connected with them; but to suppose that they can entitle us to an everlasting inheritance in heaven, is absurd. We might as Dr. Franklin has observed to the same effect with far more reason, expect to receive an ample farm, for giving a poor beggar a drink of cold water. The eternal song of the redeemed in heaven, is declared by St. John, to be, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father." But why should I urge this. Is there a Christian in the world who would be willing to have his eternal state determined by a sentence which should proceed exactly according to his merit and demerit; his virtues and his vices; his excellencies; and his errour, failings, and imperfections? Certainly not; rather the most upright

would be ready to say with the Psalmist—"Enter not into judgement with thy servant, O, Lord, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." "My hope is in the *tender mercy* of the Lord. I will make mention of his *loving kindness*, and of that only."

So likewise, when those on the left hand are pronounced cursed, and commanded to depart; the same reasons, reversed, are mentioned as the cause. "For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink," &c.

These statements do indeed show the great importance of hospitality, kindness and compassion, among mankind in this world; and in the exercise of which, especially towards Christ and his followers, the Jews were almost totally deficient; being haughty, hard hearted, covetous and cruel; as many, who make high professions of sanctity, are at the present day; especially towards those who differ from them in religious opinions. But that the neglect of these kind offices, subjects to endless misery in another world, can be sustained by no rule of equity, nor upon any principle of the christian religion; which inculcates forgiveness and reconciliation, and which teaches that eternal life is the free gift of God. But at the same time the entire absence of these social virtues, and acts of common humanity, compassion and charity, indicate a very degenerate and corrupt state of society; sufficient to account for the severe chastisements of heaven in the dispensations of divine providence in this world.

Our Saviour came, in the first place, to the Jews, but they rejected him; he came unto his own, but they received him not. His gospel was proclaimed to them, to reclaim them from their degeneracy and corruption, but they put it from them, and judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life; they knew not the day of their visitation, nor the things which belonged to their peace, and they were therefore hid from their eyes, and wrath and desolation came upon them to the uttermost.

We now come to the text, with which this whole discourse of our Saviour is concluded.—"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." It is remarkable how similar this conclusion is with that of the parable of the tares and the wheat, in the 13th chapter; which is evidently upon the same subject—the calamities of the Jews, and the blessedness of the gospel kingdom, or dispensation. *That* concludes thus,—"them which do iniquity, shall be cast into a furnace of fire: And then shall the righteous shine forth as the Sun in the kingdom of their Father."

The particular and careful illustration which we have endeavoured to give of the whole subject, in the four discourses which it has occupied, renders it unnecessary to dwell long upon this last verse. But it may be asked, if the punishment declared in the text be only *temporal*, and is to be referred to the calamities of the Jewish nation in this world, why is it called an *everlasting* punishment. In answer to which it may be remarked that such language as "everlasting," "eternal," "forever," &c., was familiar to the Jews, and is common in the scriptures, when only a limited duration is to be understood. Hence the *everlasting* hills and mountains; *everlasting* possession of Canaan, *everlasting* priesthood, statute, ordinance, covenant, &c. To the Hebrews, it was promised that they should possess the land of Canaan *forever*; they were to be made an *eternal* excellency; which is explained by saying, a joy of *many nations*. Aaron and his sons were appointed to the priesthood, to burn incense before the Lord *forever*. Joshua burnt Ai, and made it a heap *forever*. Jeremiah declares of the city of Jerusalem, that it shall remain *forever*. And by the prophet Ezekiel, the Lord says of the sons of Jacob, "they shall dwell in the land which I have given them, they and their children and their childrens' children, *forever*; and my servant David shall be their prince *forever*; and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them *forevermore*." Jonah, describing his situation in the deep, which, according to the history, was but three days, says, "The earth with her bars, was about me *forever*." But why should I multiply passages of scripture to this effect, when to cite them all, would (to employ the same figure,) be an *endless* task, and make this discourse an *everlasting* one. The words "everlasting punishment," therefore, in the text do not necessarily imply that it shall be *endless*, but only that it shall be of *long* continuance. Cruden in his concordance, observes, that "the words *eternal*, *everlasting*, *forever*, are often taken for a *long time*, and are not always to be understood strictly."

But it is said that the word used to denote the duration of the *punishment* of the *wicked*, is in the original, the same word that is employed to express the duration of the *happiness* of the *righteous* in a future state. That it is the same word which is used in both cases, is admitted; but that a *future* state, either of punishment, or of happiness, is immediately referred to in *either* case, is not admitted. That the happiness of heaven will be endless, we are fully assured. But in the text, as well as in other parts of this discourse, the punishment and miseries of the Jewish nation, are evidently placed in contrast with the happiness of Christians, under the light, and in the enjoyment of the blessings of the gospel, which reveals the true knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ,—which is declared to be *life eternal*.—While therefore the unbelieving and perverse nation of the *Jews* were to go away into *everlasting*, that is, a very long and grievous punishment and dispersion, the *righteous*—the true

believers in Christ, who is their wisdom and righteousness, should enjoy the blessings of the gospel kingdom, or dispensation, and possess that eternal life which is found in the knowledge of God, and in the manifestations of his favour and loving kindness. Did time permit, it might easily be shown that even allowing that the word *eternal* in the *latter* clause of the text, is to be understood as declaring the *endless* happiness of *heaven*, it would not necessarily follow that the same word prefixed to punishment, in the *first* clause, must also denote an *endless duration*. The signification must be determined by the connexion, and the nature of the case or subject; and by a comparison with other passages. One in particular I will here cite, which, it will be seen, is full to the purpose.—It is in the 3d chapter of the prophet Habakkuk, as follows: "God came from Teman;—and the holy one from mount Paran. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. He stood and measured the earth —he beheld and drove asunder the nations; and the *everlasting* mountains were scattered, the *perpetual* hills did bow: his ways are *everlasting*." Here then, in the *same* sentence, the *same* word must be understood differently.—The terms "everlasting" and "perpetual," as applied to mountains and hills, must have a limited meaning; but the same term *everlasting* in the latter clause, as applied to the ways of God, must signify an *unlimited* duratiou. *His* ways are *everlasting*.

We have finished our illustration of this important subject, founded on the noted passage chosen as the text. We have examined it in its connexion with the whole preceding context. We have viewed it in all its relations, in all its references and bearings. And in the interpretation, and the application made, the whole appears to us consistent, connected, and rational. A different view of it, we think, involves contradictions, and must therefore be utterly inconsistent with truth. If the doctrine of endless punishment be true and salutary, we wish not to reject it. If untrue, and dishonourable to the character of God, and consequently of pernicious tendency, we cannot choose to embrace or advocate it, however popular it may be, and however disreputable it may yet be to deny it.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

REVIEW OF AMICUS, NO 2.

In my last I inserted a third letter from Amicus, apparently designed as a reply to my review of his other two. As I said before, his communications contain some very good things. I think very well of the abilities of my correspondent; and I wish every man had a little more of one virtue of which he possesses a good share—candour. I must however tell him, the size of my paper requires him to take "leisure to be brief" and give us *multum in parvo*. I shall be glad to hear from him often, I care not how closely my sentiments or my writings are scrutinized.

With his first paragraph I have no particular fault to find. I am unable to find any essential difference between the conclusions to which he has arrived and the statements against which he reasons. The fact on the subject there agitated, I apprehend to be this.—Man is a finite being; he must therefore be limited in his mental powers; but he also has some powers, but their extent is not yet learned. Let man go to work, learn, what he can do, and then it may easily be determined, whether I have supposed him to have more power than he has.

The second paragraph of this article deserves notice because it has apparently, in the estimation of Amicus, caught me in something like false reasoning. In my review I state man loves truth; that even the fool would prefer truth to falsehood, were he to see both together. I also say that man is capable of ascertaining truth, and of distinguishing it from falsehood.—Amicus is at a loss to determine if these statements be true, "how it happens that errour has so many votaries at her shrine?" There is no difficulty in this. To have power to discover truth, or to be made capable of obtaining such a power, is one thing; to exercise that power, is another thing—very essentially different. Now I believe man is capable of distinguishing truth from falsehood, that is, in most of the subjects which can be submitted to human observation, and the reason why we have so much errour in these things, is that we do not use the ability given us, or if we do it is wasted on subjects which we can never fathom. I would have man draw the line between the world of reality and the world of conjecture, and have him study the former diligently, if he cannot learn the whole let him at least learn something. The latter may be delivered over to poets, priests, prophets and misanthropes, to be peopled with just such beings as they may choose to create.

The point which Amicus seems anxious to establish is one which nobody, in his senses, can, or will presume to deny. It is simply that man has much weakness as well as some strength. Every body knows this. His objections to me seem to have arisen from the fact, that I alter the collocation of a few words in his statement. For while he in a loud voice says, man has MUCH weakness and barely whispers he has also *some* strength, I in a uniform tone, say, "man has much strength and also some weakness." Both our positions are right. Amicus seems anxious to make all feel their weakness, while I wish to have all feel their strength as well as their weakness. Mankind have heard nothing for ages but their fallibility, their utter inability to judge of truth. It is time to speak a different language, that they may rise from the pitiable condition into which such lessons, injudiciously pronounced, have plunged them, to a just self respect and to a just confidence in their own powers.

The third paragraph is very well. It varies little from what I believe to be correct. Amicus in this paragraph grants all the liberty for which I ask. The

fourth paragraph however deserves more notice, not because it is more important, but as it touches upon some points of reasoning, which I have adopted which may need more explanation than I have hitherto afforded.

Amicus says, I "seem to scruple their being any other source of knowledge than nature." I do. But did I understand the term *nature* in the sense he does, I should not. Nature, in the sentence of mine to which he alludes, stands for the universe, with all its laws, dependencies and connections, not as we may suppose nature was some thousand centuries ago, but as it has been and as it is now. I suppose man to be in a state of nature now as much as ever he was, that the savage is no more in the state of nature than he, whom we call civilized. Hence there is no going backward or forward we are to take things as they are.

I cannot help smiling at the fear Amicus has of going back. I know not whence comes this fear. It cannot be from his aversion to labour, his letters amply refute such a notion. Now all I wish of him, or of any other one, is to look carefully at the various religious notions which now prevail, and fully, that is so far as can be, test their correctness, and to embrace and defend all that he convinces himself, is true. But I am averse to taking up opinions as we find them and yielding, or pretending to yield them assent without examining their claims upon our credence. If Amicus would recommend this course he and I differ and probably ever shall.

But Amicus thinks I have involved myself in difficulty—I mean to look out for that. I say *nature* is the only source of knowledge. But I profess to believe in the existence of God, and that too, when I say nature is unable to teach us his existence. How shall this be reconciled? Ans. The existence of God is a matter of faith and not of knowledge. We believe he exists but we do not know it, at least I do not, whatever may be the case with others.

But there is another point which Amicus has indirectly stated. He enumerates a number of events which are said to have taken place, mentions several individuals of whom he says he has heard, as Washington and Bonaparte, &c. and asks if he has no "knowledge concerning them." I supposed that Amicus was too much of a metaphysician to ask such a question. "But is not *information* knowledge?" This depends on what is meant by information and also the particular sense in which the term knowledge is understood. When I have the testimony of a man, I believe to be worthy of credit, I receive his testimony. If one, whom I have every reason I can have, to believe honest and competent to judge, that is, has a discriminating mind, relates an event which he might know and which he had no interest to misrepresent, I rely on his relation with *nearly* the same confidence I should had the event come under my own observation.

But we may as well look at the point at once. By this indirect course Amicus would design to show the bible or revelation is knowledge. This I shall deny. The truth of the bible is a matter of belief or unbelief and there are perhaps as many who disbelieve it as who believe it. Amicus may know it to be true, at least I do not know he does not, but I know I do not, though I may believe it given by inspiration. So far as the bible rests on demonstration or appeals to the operations of nature which come or may come under our observation, it may be called a source of knowledge.—But thus far it is not to be distinguished from nature for it is in fact the same. When it quits this world and tells us of another, treats of things we cannot see, and of things unconnected by any known tie with earth, though it may be true, we must say it is only a matter of faith, it may or it may not be so, we can only *believe*.

On the source of knowledge, much may be said. I conceive the only inlets of knowledge, are our senses; certainly the only objects these can receive, are the objects of nature. We may imagine a thousand things we may believe a thousand things out of the course of nature, but such things are matters of faith, and not of knowledge. The speculative parts of a religious creed, viz. the existence of God, our accountability to him, and our final destination, or a future state of existence, together with the truth of revelation, are all matters of faith, and not of knowledge. I will not say, the inspired persons, who have given us the bible, did not know; but as we can never possibly determine whether they did, or could know, their record becomes to us simply a matter of faith; and all we can know, is, whether they actually told the things they are said to have told, or not. This is a matter of testimony, and if Amicus will have it, that what he terms information, is a matter of knowledge, he may, and my position will still remain true,—"nature is the only source of knowledge;" though indeed, revelation may afford evidence for faith.

Amicus says I "ridicule such rules of government as his speculations would form," and he attempts to show mine are equally ridiculous. I stated, God will pronounce no man just, until he is just. The process of justification, according to my views, is very simple. No obscurity, no happy uncertainty of law, nor ambiguity of legal phraseology, about it. It is simply for a man to *be* just, and God will justify him. But, Amicus says, on my principles, a "man may escape punishment." And pray, does not the sinner escape punishment when Christ is punished *for* him, as the doctrine of imputed righteousness supposes? Say I am a sinner. I deserve a certain amount of punishment. Christ endures that for me. Do I suffer? Christ has paid the debt, I am therefore permitted to go free. But one thing now is wanting, my personal character is unholy. What shall be done? Why, Jesus Christ's character is holy. God says let that holy character be attributed to me. Amicus would say, I am now holy in virtue of this imputed righteousness of Christ. But when we reflect that holiness is of a personal character, it will be perceived that my own character has undergone no real change. And should God pronounce me holy, just, or justified, merely because Christ was holy, he would pronounce me thus, when in fact I was the reverse. I cannot be-

lieve God will ever do this. This is accounting things which are not as though they were.

But Amicus says, on my notions the sinner may escape, though "he have transgressed every moral obligation." How? Why, "he may come into the court, acknowledge he has done the act of which he is accused, but may justify himself by saying, "I am not now transgressing. I am now just. To punish me for what is just, is wrong. Or, to punish me now, would be punishing the just, would be punishing the righteous, and as I am now at peace, violating no law, I ought to be acquitted."

If Amicus will grant me one thing, I will say the plea of the sinner is sound, and should be received as satisfactory. Only let it be a *real fact* that he has reformed and is just, when he makes this plea, and I will contend he should be released. Earthly courts can never have this knowledge, they must therefore take such measures as will protect society from his violence. The welfare of the many is paramount to the welfare of one. Wisdom must select the best means to promote the greatest happiness for the greatest number. This is the rule with society. If punishment be necessary, it must be inflicted, though in a well regulated country I believe it unnecessary and cruel. But this can never be said of God. He knows whether the person is reformed or not, whether he is just or not, and as all he requires is, that we be just, when we are so, we shall be justified. Say one has sinned. What then? If you admit punishment, say he will be punished enough to reform him. Say he is now reformed, what more?—Nothing. God forgives the wrong he has done, blots out the memory of that wrong, and he is now accepted as just, justified, holy and righteous. What has the work of Christ to do in this? 1st. He assures us God will thus forgive and accept those who reform. 2nd. This assurance, together with other things he taught, with his example, and his death and resurrection which confirmed the whole, has a tendency to produce this reform. Christ thus brings us to repentance or produces righteousness in us, thus he is said to be "our righteousness."

But Amicus fruitful in objections and filled with a laudable zeal to defend himself, attacks through the medium of this argument of mine, my favourite tenet the final salvation of all men. He says, "all do not become righteous anteriour to the termination of this mundane existence; the means of holiness extend not beyond this life. How then can all become just?" I would thank Amicus to bestow a little attention upon the middle term of his syllogism, for as it now stands, it is most shamefully neglected. How does he know "the means of holiness do not extend beyond this life?"—When he proves this, I will notice his question. I believe the reverse, and my reasons are here: God is holy, will he be displeased to see his children like himself? Will he ever place his own offspring beyond the reach of holiness? An infinitely good God place those he has made, those he has commanded to be righteous, in a situation where they must eternally remain unrighteous? Will he who delights in goodness ever prevent his own offspring from growing better?

I know no reason why mankind, if they retain their moral and intellectual nature, in another world, may not improve there as well as here, and if they have the means and do not use them, that is another thing, to which we will attend when labouring to prove all *will* be saved. But there is no other name than the name of Jesus given *under heaven* whereby men must be saved. Very well. *Under heaven*, that is, on the earth, during life, though there may be other names in eternity. But who dare say Jesus may not be as efficient to save us after death as before? *Name* of Jesus means doctrine of Jesus, and there is no other doctrine by which any can be saved, for it is the doctrine of life and immortality. But who can say this has no efficiency after death. God will have all men to be saved. His will must be done. If all do not become righteous here they must hereafter; and I dare not limit the Almighty, I dare not say he has but one set of means for our salvation, and that he can use this set only in one place.

The remainder of this article is answered in my other review of Amicus. He has said nothing new here and I have now neither time nor inclination to add any thing to what I have there presented my readers; and I have another reason, the doctrine of *imputed righteousness* makes part of my essay on Christianity and will there be amply discussed when I get through a few discusssons I have on hand so that I can progress with it. Most if not all that is written about the law and justification by the law, or by faith, relates to the early controversies, either between the Christians and Jews, or the followers of Paul and the Judaizing Christians. Let Amicus follow out this thought and the rules I before gave him, and I think he will agree with me, that a man must become just to be so pronounced by his heavenly Father and with the Apostle that "without holiness shall no man see the Lord."

I hope to hear from Amicus often. But he must not think himself neglected, if I do not reply to every thing he may write. If he would compress his thoughts within a smaller compass and not amplify quite so much, his style would possess more real beauties and be read with more interest. He sometimes travels too far for a word when he might get a better one nearer by—better because more familiar to his readers. With these remarks we dismiss the article under review, hoping Amicus whoever he may be, will not in the expectation of having Christ's righteousness imputed to him, neglect to procure any of his own.—Editor.

FOURTH OF JULY.

On Saturday, the fourth, the firing of cannan, the merry peal of the bells, reminded us the anniversary of our national jubilee was to be celebrated by our citizens, with its usual demonstrations of joy and patriotism. We began to catch a little of the enthusiasm of the day, and were going back to the "times that tried men's souls," and were beginning to recount the incidents of that magnificent struggle for liberty, the story of which, it is hoped,

is familiar to every American school boy. The present—the present was delightful—10 or 12 millions freemen all having these recollections more enobling than any patent of kings or hereditary claims of blood, all having the most animating hopes for the future. A free government, liberal institutions, a flourishing country, wealth and population gradually increasing, patriotism kindling in every bosom—surely we may indulge the festivities of the day, and rejoice in the gift of the All-wise.

And on this day there will be harmony, we thought, just as we were enquiring which of the religious societies of our village were to be honoured by the privilege of having the citizens occupy their house for the celebration. Surely religion and patriotism may be in the same bosom, and we scarcely thought it would be necessary to ask for a house. We supposed they would at once be offered. How was it? Our Presbyterian friends, who have the largest and most commodious house, when requested to loan it, refused. We felt indignant that a religious society would refuse its meeting house to the citizens, to commemorate that day so dear to us all. But they had an excuse —they were going to celebrate it in a *religious* way.

We should be the last to speak against religion, though, as a man and as a citizen of a free government, we cannot but disapprove of much which passes under its name. Far as we can learn, the Presbyterians have made a simultaneous movement throughout the United States to celebrate the fourth of July in a pious manner; and they have done so whenever they could. There is something about this which is wrong: not the piety, but the particular characters which lead the celebration. To celebrate in a religious manner the clergy becomes necessary, and it gives the priests a chance to teach politicks, to recommend their christian party in politicks, and to point out the means to carry their plans into execution.

The effect of these new measures, or of this new way of celebrating this day, will be, that the priests will be the sole managers, and the *people* will have to imbibe their political notions from the clergy. The civilians must stand back;—statesmen must be silent, and all must listen to the sacred orator. Now we know the policy of the clergy. History shows that they never preach any political doctrine which may interfere with their own interest. Priests are monarchists, or republicans, democrats or aristocrats, just as their interests require; but their real object is the accumulation of power. We will not say they do not want power in order to be useful; but since history has informed us power is unsafe in the hands of those who plead exemption from the ordinary frailties of life, and who are governed by the laws of another world more than by those of this, we think community cannot watch too closely the craft and the measures of these men. The new mode of celebration makes the clergy necessary; thus increases their power, and must be viewed with suspicion by all who mark the signs of the times.

EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE.

We take the following from the Utica Evangelical Magazine, a paper we noticed some weeks since.

"Our readers will recollect that about two years since a controversy took place between the Magazine and the Gospel Advocate, then edited by Br. L. S. Everett, on the subject of the Convention. Since then we have seldom named or adverted to that paper; from which some have inferred the existence of enmity in our mind towards either the paper or its Editor. We therefore take this opportunity to observe, that though we were unwillingly drawn into that controversy, we believe we had the best end of it; but we neither treasured up, nor have we ever harboured, the least degree of enmity towards the Advocate or its conductors.—And although we think its present Editor, Br. O. A. Brownson, is erroneous in *some* of his views of Christianity, and his manner of treating the subject, yet in general his paper is conducted with ability, and the matter of it interesting and instructive; and we cordially reciprocate all the friendly feeling and good will manifested by the above editor in a late notice he has taken of the Evangelical Magazine."

We thank Mr. Skinner for the notice, tho' we may differ from him in our opinion respecting which had the best end of the controversy to which he alludes: and we cannot but think he would have shown more magnanimity if he believed himself the conquerer, not to have been the mouth piece of his own triumph over his fallen opponent.

We thank Mr. Skinner for the friendly feeling he has manifested towards our person. He frankly says he believes *some* of our views of Christianity, and our manner of treating the subject are *erroneous*. We wish he would just as frankly tell which of our opinions are erroneous, and frankly give his reasons for believing so.

I am not displeased to find some of my sentiments are different from his; for he certainly has some I should not wish to own: and when he wishes, I am ready to point them out, but it is of no great consequence. His paper is respectable, and we believe, is doing much good. It has a liberal patronage, and we believe, an increasing one. Perhaps it will not be saying much; but I think his paper, since the commencement of the third volume, has a visible improvement. It assumes a higher and more independent tone, and exhibits a good share of talent. We wish the paper success. Not, of course, to the injury of the Advocate. But

there is room enough for us all, and any little jealousies of this kind, are unworthy the dignity and sacredness of our cause. We wish every paper in our connection could double the list of subscribers; and if all but ours could do it, we should still be glad: for we should believe truth was spreading, and the condition of man growing better. May we all "endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace."—Ed.

BLACK RIVER ASSOCIATION.

The minutes and proceedings of this Association, would have been given in our last, but were not received till our paper was nearly all in type. We attended the meeting of the Association, and can truly say it was a pleasant one. The brethren there, received us with pleasure, and with cordial hospitality. The cause—the cause so dear to every philanthropist, seems advancing at a pleasing rate in that section. Our ministering brethren there are not numerous, but they appear to be faithful, and successful. They were all strangers, except by report, to ourself; but we trust the slight acquaintance we formed, will be ripened into a lasting friendship. By the by, we cannot forbear expressing the hope, that our divisions and altercations are over, and that we shall again "behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Universalists in this state, for these three or four years past, have been deeply afflicted. Division had come in among them, and brother become cold to brother; but that time is gone we hope, and we think we already see the sun of peace beaming from behind the dispersing cloud which has darkened our prospects!

We had occasion to visit the village of Watertown, six miles from the place where the Association met. We have neither time nor room to describe it, but we think it one of the most pleasant and most flourishing, among the numerous villages of this state. But, the kindness and urbanity of the inhabitants, give the place its charms. There is a society of Universalists, who having a neat and commodious house for worship, and enjoying the labours of our highly esteemed Br. Pitt Morse, "whose praise is in the churches," presented to us a picture the most pleasing we saw in our tour, and one which we could but envy, though we are not invidious.—Editor.

ENCOURAGING.

Our friends in Genoa, Cayuga Co. N. Y. have resolved to build them a house for worship. They have the requsite sum subscribed, and anticipate being able to put up the frame, and enclose it this season. This contemplated house, which we have no doubt, will be erected, will set an example that other societies may follow. It will be the first Universalist meeting house erected within a circuit of fifty miles either way from it: at least we are not aware of there being any in that distance. And yet, no section of country has a much larger share of liberal minded men. Why is this so?

The society at Genoa is in a flourishing condition, and it is too, one of the most pleasant—perhaps we say so because we have lived with them, and shared their kind offices. May they go forward, and may the Lord prosper them in their laudable undertaking.—Editor.

To Correspondents.—Br. W. I Reese is informed his very acceptable letter is received, for which he will please accept our thanks. It shall appear in our next. We hope he will continue his communications, and that he will do what he can to correct our errours, and prevent us from misleading our readers. We wish him to keep as cool as he can, for it will give more weight to his arguments. We must request him to send us short articles. If he has much to say, let him take time for it. We want to write some ourself, and we wish to give all our correspondents a place. But our correspondents will, upon reflection, perceive an article of one page and half, is as long as is profitable. If longer ones are sent, we shall not feel ourself bound to insert them. Amicus we trust, will let us hear from him again. A. C. must not be idle. His friends Mr. S. and Mr. I. may think themselves neglected.

We have received from Br. Kneeland a pamphlet containing an appeal to the Universalists on the subject of excommunication for difference of opinion. It is an able, judicious, and candid appeal, and tho' we would not be understood as subscribing to every sentiment it contains, we can say as we have said before, we see nothing that is offensive to our orthodoxy. We see nothing which requires us to deny him the Christian name. We shall take the opportunity to present the pamphlet with a *review* of it, to our readers, soon.

To James Luckey No. 4, shall appear in our next.

Notice.—Those subscribers who have availed themselves of the time allowed for the advance price to be received have our thanks, and we should have been highly gratified if all had done so. Those who have not yet paid are informed that $1,50 will be accepted for the paper, if forwarded soon. The publisher, grateful for the liberal patronage afforded him by the publick, is willing to be as indulgent as he can consistently with the interests of the paper. Agents will therefore exercise some discretion on this subject, and if paid soon they will tax our subscribers only $1,50, though our terms would allow us to exact $2,00.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

MINUTES

Of the proceedings of the Black River Association of Universalists, convened in Rutland, Jefferson County, N. Y. June 10th, 1829.

Met at the house of Col. Tucker. Addressed the throne of Grace with prayer, by Br. A. Wood. Organized the council, by choosing Br. C. G. Person, Moderator, and Br. P. Morse, Clerk. Adjourned to attend publick service.

ORDER OF THE MORNING SERVICE.

Introductory prayer by Br. D. Skinner.—Sermon by Br. A. Wood. Text, Matthew xxiii, from the 29th verse, to the end of the chapter. Concluding prayer by Br. C. G. Person.

MET IN COUNCIL.

Appointed Brs. P. Morse and A. Wood a committee to receive requests for letters of fellowship or ordination during the present session of this body.

Heard and approved the report of the committee of discipline for the last year. Adjourned for publick worship.

ORDER OF DIVINE SERVICE, P. M.

Introductory prayer by Br. P. Morse.—Sermon by Br. O. A. Brownson, Text, Prov. iv. 7. Concluding prayer by Br. A. Wood.

MET IN COUNCIL.

Heard the reports of delegates, and read the letters from the several societies represented in our council. Adjourned till eight o'clock Thursday morning. Prayer by Br. O. A. Brownson.

Met THURSDAY morning according to adjournment. Prayer by Br. C. G. Person.

Appointed Brs. C. G. Person and P. Morse a committee of discipline for the ensuing year.

Appointed Br. C. G. Person a visiting committee to attend the next session of the Cayuga Association, and also to attend the next session of the Genesee Association. Appointed Br. A. Wood a visiting committee to attend the next session of the St. Lawrence Association.

Voted, that Brs. C. G. Person, P. Morse, J. C. Foster, and J. Mendell, be a delegation to attend the next session of the Universalist Convention of this State, to be holden at Utica on the second Wednesday in May next.

Voted, that the revised constitution of this body, proposed by the committee appointed last year for that purpose, be received and adopted. Adjourned for publick service.

ORDER OF THE MORNING SERVICE, THURSDAY.

Introductory prayer by Br. C. G. Person. Sermon by Br. O. A. Brownson. Text, Prov. xix. 3. Concluding prayer by Br. D. Skinner.

AFTERNOON SERVICE.

Introductory prayer by Br. P. Morse. Sermon by Br. D. Skinner. Text, 1 Corrinth. iii. 19. Concluding prayer by Br. C. G. Person.

MET IN COUNCIL.

Voted, that this council approve of the recommendation of the central association at their last session, relative to the publication of pamphlets.*

Voted, that Br. P. Morse be a corresponding committee to co-operate with the editorial committee of the central association on the said subject.

Voted, that Br. A. Wood prepare the minutes of this body for publication, and accompany the same with a circular letter. Also, that the respective Editors of the Evangelical Magazine, and Gospel Advocate, be requested to publish the same in their papers.

Voted, to adjourn this body to meet in the village of Antwerp, Jefferson County, N. Y. on the second Wednesday and following Thursday in June, 1830. Prayer at the adjournment by Br. O. A. Brownson.

C. G. PERSON, *Moderator.*
P. MORSE, *Clerk.*

THE CIRCULAR.

The Black River Association of Universalists: To the brethren and sisters of like precious faith, grace, mercy and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

BELOVED IN THE LORD: In addressing you on this interesting occasion, we greatly rejoice in the manifested goodness of our heavenly Father, who, by his special favour to usward, enableth us to state to you that our annual convocation was attended with the tokens of Divine approbation. The business of the council was conducted satisfactorily, in the spirit of christian friendship and cordiality. The reports from the several societies were encouraging, and evinced that though the prevalence of the glorious light of the divine truth of impartial and unlimited grace, with its salutary and benign influence, be not as rapid as the benevolent mind most fervently desires, yet its progress is steady, firm and effectual.

Our publick meetings for social worship were well attended, and the appropriate and salutary instructions, admonitions, and consolations, administered by the heralds of salvation, were joyfully received by the serious, devoted and attentive audience. And our parting was accompanied with the most tender emotions of glowing friendship and consequent regret.

Dear Brethren—the glorious prospect of the final, powerful, sin-consuming, soul-saving, and universally reconciling influence and consequent glory of the gospel of impartial grace, demand our most devout gratitude and adoration towards the Divine Author of our being, Eternal Father of our spirits, and never failing source of all our mercies.

*We enter our vote against this measure. We are willing mankind should be enlightened, but we cannot consent to build up again what we have been pulling down.—[ED. GOS. ADV.

For the manifestation of the pure desires to yield a cheerful compliance to the above demand, we invite, 1st—Our Ministering Brethren to be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might, putting on the whole armour of God. To be steadfast and unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for as much as you know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord. And although discouraging aspects may present their terrifick fronts, and privations, with their attendant menacing and perplexing cares, press upon your ardent glowing benevolent souls, and render bitter and painful your otherwise delightful services; still, brethren, struggle on and faint not, for in due time ye shall reap in joy, from that which you have sown in tears. To repress murmers and unite cheerful perseverence in your labours of love, listen to the relations of our venerable fathers in the ministry of reconciliation. What oppositions, slanders, labours, and privations they encountered! and how have they triumphed over a load of woes! and how do our hearts vibrate while they, with cheeks bedewed with crystal drops, which bespeak their unutterable emotions of grateful pleasures in view of the success of their indefatigable labours of love, detail their past scenes and present prospects! And under what more favourable circumstances do they and their successors now with pleasure proclaim the world's salvation! Or turn your oppressed attention to the toils and sufferings, sorrows and persecutions, of the Great Captain of our Salvation, and of his immediate followers; and then view the thousands now perishing for lack of knowledge. And glance your thoughts to the future, when in the decline of life you may derive the sweetest consolations from the remembrance of the past fervent desires and toils, and the then present satisfactory testimonials of the beneficent success which shall have attended and crowned your patient persevering exertions, for the promotion of the best interests of your fellow nature; pushing forward your exulting contemplations, till they arrive at the august period so often glanced at by the ancient servants of God, when every knee shall bow; when all things shall be reconciled; when God shall finish transgression, and make an end of sin; and when all flesh shall see the salvation of God. When his own soft hand shall wipe the tears from every weeping eye; and pains, and groans, and griefs, and fears, and death itself, shall die.

And, in view of these all important subjects, we invite the attention of the brothers and sisters who love the truth and rejoice in the hope of the final emancipation of all the wide spread family of man from sin and guilt, errour and griefs, doubts and fears, to a serious reflection on the importance of union and co-operation in the glorious work of universal reformation. Much, very much of the success of our ministerial labours depends on the united exertions of the great body of believers. You may aid, brethren and sisters, in this blessed cause by your exemplary lives. By cultivating peace and unity in your several societies, and, as far as practicable, with all men: by cherishing kind and charitable sentiments towards those who differ from us in religious opinions: by dealing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God: by your zealous and punctual attendance on the preached word, and on other meetings for social worship. For when the servant of Jesus and of his church enters the place of publick worship, and casts his eyes over the devoted spot; if, instead of beholding the seats occupied by serious, anxious and cheerful expectants, he meets the repelling and soul-damping tokens of cold inattention, empty seats, and naked walls, an uncontrollable reluctance pervades at once his friendly (and under different appearances) ardent spirits: and thus the generous, faithful few, who do attend, are deprived in part of that sublime feast which they had a right to expect, and probably would have realized, had not the paralizing effects of inattentive (though otherwise valuable) members, checked the flowing stream of delightful and instructive communications of the speaker. Whereas, on the contrary, when a brother in the ministry, on entering the house of worship, beholds in every direction the apparently wishful, hungry multitude waiting with solicitude to receive the sacred message, his devoted soul and cheerful tongue attuned harmoniously, catching fire from the holy altar, pour forth the bread and water of life, which, by diligent application in research, and judicious selection, he has culled from the inexhaustible treasures of wisdom and knowledge—the sacred scriptures.

And, lastly, by your friendly pecuniary supplies. We do not wish to see our preachers basking in earthly splendour and pleasures, nor their families flaunting in gaudy show of vanity, nor together wallowing in deleterious luxury, thereby rendering themselves worse than useless. But "the labourer is certainly worthy of his meat." And, "thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn:" much less the ox that breaketh up the ground to receive the seed. If every member of our body bestows the mite which he or she can spare without any injury to him or his family, in something that would sustain nature, our ministering brethren would be relieved from perplexing cares and depressing anxieties; and their minds, thus liberated, could soar to the sublime regions of Divine Revelation, contained in the Bible, and from that exalted eminence could point the anxiously enquiring traveller to the emaculate, boundless ocean of unmingled goodness, light and truth; and would be enabled to give to each and to all their portion in due season.

Finally, Brethren, farewell. Be perfect; be of good comfort; live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you.

By order. A. WOOD.

CONSTITUTION

ADOPTED JUNE, A. D. 1829.

Article 1*st.* This Association shall be known and distinguished by the name of the Black River Association of Universalists.

Art. 2*d.* It shall be the duty of this Association to hold an annual session according to previous adjournment.

Art. 3*d.* The boundaries of the Counties of Jefferson, Lewis, and Oswego, shall form the proper boundaries of this Association, except in cases wherein societies or churches of our order, within the borders of adjacent counties, shall deem it a privilege to connect themselves with us.

Art. 4*th.* It shall be the duty of every church and society conjoined, and of every society wherein no church has been formed, belonging to this Association, to appoint two delegates to attend each annual session of this body; which delegates, on presenting a certificate from the clerk of their respective societies, shall be considered members of the council.

If any society shall fail to appoint their annual delegation, it shall become their duty to represent their religious condition to this body by letter.

Art. 5*th.* If any joint church and society, or society only, shall fail to represent themselves to this body for three successive years, such church and society, or society only, shall be considered no longer in fellowship with this Association.

Art. 6*th.* All ministers of the gospel, residing within the limits of this body, having the fellowship of this or any other Universalist Association, shall be considered *ex officis* members of the council.

All Universalist ministers not residing within the limits of this Association, may be received as members of its council by vote.

Art. 7*th.* Each member of the council shall be entitled to one vote, and all matters, except the alteration or amendment of this Constitution, shall be determined by a majority.

Art. 8*th.* The business of the Association, when assembled, shall be, to choose a Moderator, a Clerk, and other officers if necessary; examine the state of churches and societies within its jurisdiction; extend fellowship to, or withdraw it from societies; appoint committees on particular subjects; hear and receive or reject their reports; receive requests from ministering brethren for letters of fellowship or ordination; grant or refuse the same, and adopt such other measures as may be thought conducive to the general prosperity of Zion.

Art. 9*th.* It shall be the duty of this Association annually to appoint a committee of discipline, to consist of not more than three of its members, whose duty it shall be to hear complaints brought against any preacher belonging to this body; and such committee shall be empowered to suspend, at their discretion, a preacher, charged with immoral conduct, from the fellowship of this Association, until its next succeeding session, and notify the publick accordingly.

Art. 10*th.* In all cases of personal difficulty between ministering brethren, or between a ministering brother and any church or society in fellowship with this body, the respective parties shall have the privilege of settling their differences by means of a mutual council; but if the above specified method be found impracticable, they may refer the matter to the committee of discipline; and said committee shall examine and try the case, and make their report at the next session of this body.

Art. 11*th.* Any person who shall be in fellowship with this Association as a preacher of the gospel, who shall discontinue his publick ministry during three successive years, shall be considered no longer in fellowship with this body; always excepting those cases, in which a ministering brother shall discontinue his publick labours on account of sickness or age.

Art. 12*th.* Any person, in order to receive the fellowship of this association as a preacher of the gospel, must have preached in an acceptable manner six months, and must possess an unblemished moral character: and every preacher must have been an approved labourer in the ministry for six months after the reception of his letter of fellowship, before he can receive ordination; which may be conferred at the annual session of this body, or by a council appointed for that purpose, by the church or society over which he is to be ordained.

Art. 13*th.* No member of the council shall withdraw from its deliberations without the permission of the Moderator.

Art. 14*th.* This Association disclaims all authority to pass any further censure upon any individual, church, or society, except that of withdrawing fellowship.

Art. 15*th.* Any alterations or amendments may be made in this Constitution, which shall be sanctioned by two thirds of the members of the council, at any annual session.

FATE.—A FRAGMENT.

And what is Fate, that we attribute to it whatever we are often compelled to suffer? Life is often a bitter curse, but to whom? and why is it so? When life was a slave to boyish fancy, I had dreams; scenes of bliss were presented, filled with a thousand beauties to captivate an unchastened imagination. 'Twas then I painted life a velvet lawn, and the path I was to walk, leading through a beautiful landscape, dotted with woodlands, cultivated fields, flowery meads, verdant pastures, where the peace-

ful herds and flocks were grazing.—The murmuring brook was not forgotten, and the rural cottage surrounded by the honeysuckle and the woodbine, with the adjacent grove where the birds warbled their soft notes. And the friend whose soul was my own, or one dearer than friend, and the choice books—all were in my dreams. Time was to pass in uninterrupted delight—no cloud was ever to obscure the glory of the sun, and the moon was always, at night, to shine in her silver brightness.—I was to live in an eternal paradise.

The romance of youth fled before the light of experience, and reality strongly belied those early dreams. The light and dancing form of pleasure vanished, and the poetry of life was degraded to sober prose. Man, who was in my dreams, all sensibility and disinterestedness, whose heart breathed in his words, whose soul was at the service of his friend, was a cool, calculating selfish being, absorbed in his own interest, and even woman, though always a line of poetry amid a world of prose, and a magick being, still was not the perfect celestial supposed.

And there came—I know not what, but a sternness of feature over the face of things, and I looked on life with other eyes, heard with other ears, and seemed to judge with other senses. There was bitterness in the cup I drank; a painful sensation sometimes troubled the heart, I knew not why. There were some I loved,—they departed. Some tender ties still entwined, there were lives dependant on mine, hearts whose pulsations were to correspond to mine. I wished them happy. Stern unyielding poverty came—the cottage lost its charms. Separation came, distance, doubt, suspension, a fever of the brain, internal anguish not to be described—the fitful gleams of hope came but to darken despair which followed.

A dungeon held me—no crime had I committed—others were dying around me—my death was near, the warrant was signed. Malevolence taunted, ignorance mocked. The philosopher spake of his concatenation of causes and effects, of the laws of nature, and fitness of things. I had been forced from the path I ought to have walked, consequently what came, could not be avoided. Others said it was *fate*, a non descript of which I never could understand aught. The Optimist would console me by saying all was for the best—that my pain heightened my pleasure, that had I never been miserable I should never had known my happiness; that my being deprived of freedom, made me realize what I enjoyed when I had my liberty; that if I escaped I should remember what I suffered, and would feel greatful for my escape. If I died I should be delivered from more suffering. The religionist told me it was a blessed trial sent from a merciful Father, and I should be rewarded hereafter. The moralist said it was owing to my own misconduct.

The answers were all no doubt very satisfactory to those who gave them. I concluded the fault was in the state of the mind; for if the mind be right we may enjoy ourselves in a dungeon, as well as in a palace, all depends on the mind. But—I could never bring the mind to be reconciled to unpleasant things. I therefore said, "keep the mind happy, and you will never suffer;" but Fate, evil genius, seems to prevent the mind from being right when the body is not where we wish it. SENEX.

To Elder Ichabod Clark, of Scipio:

REV. SIR—You will excuse me for this unexpected address, when I assure you that nothing short of a sincere wish to elucidate truth and expose errour, could have prompted me at this time, to call your attention to review some arguments that you advanced on the first Sabbath in June, from 1st Cor. xiii 9. "But, when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." In view of the subject, you define the imperfections of the human mind, in all the deformity peculiar to its nature. You tell us how very imperfect are all our views of God. You tell us, that the Saint, that the Philosopher, even all of them since the foundation of the world, have been veiled as in the shadow of night, and have perceived but a faint dawn of the approaching day—clothed in imperfection, they knew not God, nor the perfections of Heaven—you deplore the miserable situation of the whole world; their sins and imperfections are painted in the most gloomy colours. We know not ourselves—we know not our nearest and most intimate connexions, &c. You then go on to describe perfection. You define God, heaven, and all the ransomed sons of Zion; tell us all their perfections: you tell us that the blessed sons of God shall there receive perfect light, that when heaven receives them, the veil shall be taken from before their eyes; they shall then see, with perfect clearness, the whole kingdom and glory of God. Every star, and the whole planetary system, will be more familiar, and better understood, than can be described in this imperfect world,—that heaven is a place of perfect happiness; that all things conspire to augment the felicity of the righteous, and nothing can in the least mar the enjoyments of any. This is all very well, but what follows? Saints can look from those blissful mansions, into the very depths of hell. There they can see sinners writhing in despair, where hope can never come; there they can behold their nearest relations, their once lovely and affectionate companions; those with whom their hearts twined with the fondest delight—behold them in all the agonies of hell, in the vast reservoir of the wrath of an angry God, fraught with fire unquenchable, where nothing can be heard but the shrieks of the damned and the howling of demons! O ye saints of

Heaven, is this your joy unspeakable and full of glory! All this the saints can behold and feel perfectly happy, they are fully reconciled and so completely changed that they glory and rejoice as much in witnessing the damned in Hell as the blessed in Heaven. O ye orthodox comforters! this is your heart-cheering doctrine! this is teaching the love of God shed abroad in the hearts of men! this is your teachings of Christ's word and doctrine! this is showing forth the examples of that love we should have one for another!

I ask the question and wish to be answered, how are we to look on saints in this world? what disposition do they possess? do they rejoice at the miseries of the world? do they glory in suffering humanity? are they happy while others weep? do we call this the God-like love of a Christian? is this the manner in which you define charity in the fore part of your discourse? how do you reconcile your discourse in its various points? by what power has your mind become so much more illuminated than all the Saints and Philosophers that have gone before you? You told us how very imperfect they all were, how little they knew of God, of Heaven and of Hell; you then proceed to define in positive terms the exact character of God, the situation of Heaven, the perfections and even views of its inhabitants, and the very extent of Hell with all its horrors; this is more than all other Saints and Philosophers could do. They could not scan the perfections of Deity; they could not penetrate the hidden treasures of his will, while they were clothed in this tabernacle of clay. But this is a new era, this is a day of special visitation, behold we have seen a man that could tell us all these things. Now I want this man to tell us more, let him inform us how all those imperfect Saints can go to Heaven, so long as there is no change of character after death? Heaven is a place of perfection—no unclean thing can enter there—the Saints must appear without blemish; their garments completely white, without the least spot or pollution, perfected in every sense of the word. How will the imperfect Saints over get there without a change?

Here I might have closed but a more recent discourse on the new birth needs some comment, the words selected are in the gospel of John, 3d ch. 7th verse, "Marvel not that I say unto thee ye must be born again." In describing this birth, you say, "it is bringing man back into his primitive state, into that state in which he was created—that it is not being made new, but being completely changed and all must be effected in this world." Now let us reason together Mr. Clark, let us examine the subject in its true light. If man is brought back into that perfect state in which he was first created and is completely changed while in this world how can he any longer sin.—What does Christ mean when he tells of sending the Comforter, that when he the spirit of truth is come he will guide you into all truth? If they are guided into all truth they must certainly be free from errour. John in his first Epistle, 2d chapter, 9th verse, is a little more explicit—"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin because he is born of God."—You say in your remarks, "that it is the duty of the Christian to pray and that they always pray in faith," but I ask what faith do they manifest when they pray that the grace of God may be shed abroad in every heart; believing at the same time that three-fourths of the human family will be eternally damned? If they believe that God in his will and providence has determined that a part of the family of man shall suffer endless burnings they ought to pray for it, and if they were so wonderfully reconciled to his will they would limit their prayers to the chosen few, but our divines are more liberal than their God, they mourn over the awful destinies of Man, they suffer persecution and would even death itself, if they could be the means of bringing one soul to glory. Nothing is wanting in the pious Fathers of the Church, but power to save every son and daughter of Adam. What a blessing it would be if their God was half so good, for he has all power to will and to do, yet some must perish eternally, their prayers of faith to the contrary notwithstanding. How many tears of bitter anguish would have been saved and even rivers of blood if you had only been reconciled to your God and let all those Infidels and reprobates go to hell according to God's appointment! But you are not satisfied with that, you have ever been striving to destroy heresy, to redeem mankind, and consequently frustrate the whole plan of your angry God. You further say, "they do not repent until after they have received the new birth" and to impress it more forcibly you repeat it and wish not to be misunderstood, now I ask and wish to be answered, if they are born of God before repentance, why is it necessary to repent afterwards? And after they are perfected in Christ what do they do to repent of. Please to answer the above and oblige yours respectfully. MARCUS.

PROPOSAL, By T. FISK,

For publishing by subscription, in the city of New-York, a Treatise on Divine Government, by Dr. Southwood Smith, from the fourth London edition.

This work is too well known to the American public to need any recommendation. It will be printed on good paper, with new type. The volume will contain from three to four hundred pages, 12mo, and will be afforded for $1 bound. Agents who forward five dollars, will receive six copies. The work will be put to press immediately. Depositaries will be established in all the principal towns in the country. Orders may be addressed to T. Fisk, N. Y.

Br. Fisk of the New-York Gospel Herald, is requested to notice in his paper, that the sermon from L. S. Everett, published in his 13th No., was first published in the 6th No. of the Gospel Advocate. He is requested to do this because he informed his readers that Br. Everett was engaged as a contributor for the Herald, and that two sermons were expected from him soon. We have authority for saying Mr. Everett has never engaged to contribute for Mr. Fisk's paper, and we think Mr. F. has not taken the proper course to make his readers believe so. The Religious Inquirer also copied the same without giving us credit. We always intend to give credit to the papers from which we extract.

We insert in this No. the last of the four sermons from Br. Rayner on Math. xxv 46. We trust our readers have been amply rewarded for reading them. We think we could not have offered the sincere Chrisian, desirous of information, on a long contested point, a more acceptable treat; and though our engagement was to publish original sermons, we think no apologies necessary for having published these from the Religious Inquirer.

We hope soon to be able to go on with our Essays, and particularly to pay some attention to our Orthodox friends. We almost fear they will think themselves neglected. Sometimes we almost fear we have given them reason to think we disregard them. But we do not. We have had an eye on their measures, and we have watched their proceedings. They seem almost desperate. Dr. Ely has come out and said he "did not *mean* so." He says he does not want any one of the religious denominations of this country to have their tenets established by law. It is very well. We are glad if he does not. But the Dr. has forfeited our confidence. He must perform a lustration for his character, or he will ere long find it condemned to lasting infamy.

We have never supposed the Orthodox were for having their religion established by law, at least not immediately; but it is by certain artificial means to overwhelm publick sentiment, and to place themselves in the capacity of dictators. They wish to govern the ballot boxes, that every man in office shall be obedient to them. They petitioned to have the mail stopped on the Sabbath; not because they feared that God would be angry at the rolling of the carriage wheels on that day, but simply that they might have a post, a rallying point, around which they could collect the people. They doubtless never expected to succeed. But on their failure they could tell the publick what they lost by having Infidel rulers. This would bring to mind the ballot-boxes—vote for none but Orthodox.

The clergy are trying hard to have the people receive their views of government and politicks from them. You must have your *religious* celebration on the fourth of July, where none but clergymen shall officiate, that whatever political sentiment is advanced, shall be seasoned with due regard to the clergy, that they may become our only instructors in things spiritual and temporal. Who does not discover their craft? They are to work more silently, but more dangerously. Theymust be watched. Watch, therefore watch!"

From the Remember Me, for 1829.

THE RAISING OF LAZARUS.

BY REV. G. W. DOANE.

"And Jesus litted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me. And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth."

There was a voice of wailing
In Bethany that day,
And darkly on that mournful home
The cloud of sorrow lay,
And deeply was the fount of grief
In woman's bosom stirred,
And thickly fell its bitter drops
In each low murmured word:
For never from that blessed source
Of perfectness above,
Was shed on earth a purer joy,
Than in a sister's love;
And never pours the bursting heart
A deeper, darker flow,
Than o'er a brother's coffined clay—
A sister's sacred woe.

There was a voice of joyfulness
In Bethany that day,
And brightly on that happy home
The sun of gladness lay,
And deeply was the fount of joy
In woman's bosom stirred,
And fervent rose its grateful praise,
In each exulting word!
For purer, fuller, holier streams,
Than in a sister's love,
Flowed never from that blessed fount
Of perfectness above;
And deeper warmer, gushing tears,
On earth were never shed,
Than fell that day upon his neck—
The rescued from the dead.

Oh! ever thus, on those who love,
And humbly serve the Lord,
His blessings and his chastisements
In mingled streams are poured:
His chastisements to bring to earth
Each thought and purpose high;
His blessings to lift up our hearts
To him above the sky.
Then who, whate'er betide, will doubt
That all disposing arm,
Which guides our feet to every good,
And guards from every harm;
Since sorrow like that darkest hour
That just precedes the day,
Is only sent to fit our hearts
For joy's unclouded ray!

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, JULY 25, 1829. [NO. 15.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

ON TRUSTING IN PROVIDENCE.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

Delivered at Auburn, N. Y. 4th Subbath in June, 1829.

"Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat: the flocks shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stall: Yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation."—Hab. iii. 17, 18.

No injunction is more frequently enforced, no duty, whether moral or religious, whether natural or positive, is more frequently recommended with every variety of argument, than is our supposed obligation to trust in God and to commit all our interests to the disposal of the Most High. From time immemorial has this been enjoined as our most imperious duty, and every one who has been able to procure a surplice or a black coat and ascend the steps of a pulpit, deems it his prerogative to exclaim continually "put your trust in God;" and every one who has been the subject of "special grace," who has had his sins washed away by the outpourings of enthusiasm, assumes to himself the right to warn sinners to repent, to harp constantly upon the great duty of trusting in God and to exhort us to be resigned to the Divine will even though that will should consign us to eternal night.

But notwithstanding the hoary age of this doctrine and the character of those who have laboured to explain and to enforce its obligation, it is little understood and perhaps there is no duty the nature and reasonableness of which is not more clearly perceived and more duly appreciated. It may not then, be unprofitable for us to spend a few moments at this time, in examining into the *character* of this injunction, its *reasonableness*, and also to *enforce* it so far as found to be proper, and to draw from it such inferences, as may prepare us to go forward with renewed ardour in the great work of meliorating the condition of mankind.

1. There are few subjects which have not a negative as well as an affirmative side. Trusting in God is *not* sitting inactive, and vainly imagining the Deity will provide for our wants without any exertions of our own. This is presuming on Providence, and expecting that which every thing in nature assures us we shall not receive. All nature is in motion. Throughout the whole one part seems to act for another; and throughout the whole of this vast machine, called the Universe we see a concatenation of causes and effects, or of certain means adapted to the accomplishment of certain ends. To expect any of these ends will be accomplished without the appointed means being used, is to expect that which we have never yet seen verified, and something which we have no warrant to believe we ever shall.

That God governs the world, is admitted by the Philosopher as well as by the Christian, but that he governs it by a special agency, or by any immediate control, need not, and when properly understood, will not, enter the creed of either. It is indeed often asserted, but will never be believed by him, who has any just conceptions of the great system of things with which we are connected.

There is too much imperfection, too much evil every where prevalent, to allow us to pronounce every thing the work of an all powerful, wise and benevolent God. Say Jehovah is a being of absolute, of unbounded perfection, and reconcile, if you can, this idea, with the assertion that he governs every event, and that his immediate agency produces every thing which is in the existing state of affairs. Let your eyes run over society; mark the evils which prey upon the human race—man devouring man; brother supplanting brother; —nations waring against nations—pestilence winging its noxious flight, scattering death in its progress—famine sweeping off its thousands, carrying destruction to every department of life—poverty, stern unyielding poverty, binding millions in its grasp, and making them mere footstools for the more prosperous—take this view and tell me is this what we might naturally expect from a Being whose nature is love and whose power is infinite?

God no doubt governs the world. But he governs by those laws he inscribed on matter when he gave it birth, and by those he impressed an organized life, on the morning of its creation. These laws all nature does and must obey. I ask not their wisdom nor their utility; but without some knowledge of them, hopes of happiness are vain.

Man cannot be rich without the use of means, learned without application to study nor knowing without investigation. Just as absurd

to expect that God will make one happy when he neglects the means which the order of the Divine government requires him to exercise. The laws of God stamp indolence as the severest curse ever endured by man; these laws have determined man shall be an active being, and that his felicity shall be purchased by the sweat of his brow. Neither Providence nor Grace promise us aught that is good for trusting in God while our duty is unperformed, or while we neglect those measures we should adopt.

2. But trusting in God, as it should be understood, is to exert ourselves, and to repose the fullest confidence in Providence that when we have performed our duty, our labour shall not be in vain; that though we see not the desired reward, though we obtain not the desired good, we are to rely on Providence that it will soon or late be received.

There is in man no small disposition to fret at the circumstances in which he is placed, and to be impatient of the least cross or disappointment he is compelled to experience. He cannot, and if he can, he ought not reconcile himself to suffering without endeavouring to remove it—but if he trusts in God, feels the confidence, which constitutes the duty we are illustrating, that all things will eventually work together for good, he will cease to complain of much which would otherwise excite constant murmuring.

To trust in God requires us to believe God is good. Without the conviction that he is good, we cannot trust him. Nor can men put their trust in a being they believe to be bad.—Paint the character of God as I have often seen it represented, and by those too who imagined they loved him—paint him as he often is painted, the tyrant and not the Father of nature—seated in the distant heavens, looking down with scorn upon the multitude below—mocking the miseries of his people, and commanding the angels of his vengeance to kindle the fires of hell, where the victims of his hate shall writhe with the bitter pangs of remorse, their bodies swell and burst with the perpetually increasing heat of Almighty fury! Paint him on Sinai convulsed, surrounded by the smoke and flames of the enraged mountain, hurling the winged bolts of wrath at man—at weak defenceless man—sporting with untold torture—drinking pleasure from the dying groans of creatures himself has made—his eye resting with delight on a ruined and devastated world! Paint him thus, and say ye who have hearts to feel, and more than all, minds to think, can ye love him? Swells the heart with the warm, the blissful emotion of love as you contemplated the picture! Does his character inspire you with confidence? feel you a desire to fly to his arms and trust your all to him?

Deluded man may say be trusts, but his heart turns rebel to his words, and give him liberty and it will overflow with indignation at the thought. Nor will man willingly place himself within the power of one he hates; and the very constitution of his nature compels him to hate a being like the one we have described. To trust in God, to put confidence in the Most High, we must believe him good, and to trust all to his wise disposal, we must view him as the Universal Parent, unbounded in his love and overflowing with kindness to all.

When we view Jehovah as the parent of the Universe, when we contemplate him as that Being whose nature is love, on whose countenance eternally plays the smile of benignity, who speaks but to bless, and issues no command but to beatify sentient existence—mercy beaming from his presence and all the virtues, all the excellencies and all the perfections surrounding his throne and giving permanence to his reign and felicity to his subjects—when we thus view his character, we see so much loveliness, so much worth we fly at once to his arms, we lean on his bosom, we trust ourselves, our all to his wise and parental care.

But to trust in God we must believe him not only good, but we must believe he *loves us*.—Vain were the attempt to put out trust in a being we believed regarded not our interests.—Though his bounteous hand were seen pouring down blessings upon others, though for them he should distribute the choicest of heavens treasures and permit the glories of the celestial regions to beam in full effulgence upon their habitation, and though he should commission the angels of love, of peace and pleasure, to smooth their path and to carpet it with flowers—all were useless, would be unable to inspire the least confidence in the bosom of the forlorn individual, who believed himself forsaken or unbeloved by the Great Father of all. "Others," he would say, "others receive, let others trust. But for me—for me what hope? Deity disregards me. Heaven speaks, but not for me. I hear a voice, but it comes not to the heart; it wakes within me, lone and dejected, no confiding emotion. The sun displays his beams; the showers distill their genial influence; the germ springs forth, the green blade appears; the air becomes fragrant with unfolding blossoms; nature changes her verdant robes—puts on her golden crown, and her luxuriant harvest gladdens the hearts of thousands—But what is all this to me? Jehovah does not love, he does not regard me. What is there to remove the solitude I feel within? What to chase away the dark, desponding thoughts, which sting through the brain? What can inspire *me* with confidence in God? or lead me to recline on his bosom for protection?"

Such would be one's reflections were he called upon to put his trust in that God who, as he believes, does not regard him. But change the case—let a man believe that God loves *him*,

and has a regard for *his* welfare, that the laws of nature and of Providence are designed as much for him as for any other, then he will feel himself safe, will see a being he can deem worthy of confidence, and he will give his heart to God and trust all to him. But unless it be allowed Jehovah is good unto all, that his tender mercies are over all his works, that he regards the interests of all he has made, can any particular individual without a *special revelation* to that effect, believe assuredly he is loved by Heaven? or without this conviction can he have the assurance required? While I admit Deity disregards some, how am I to be assured I am not one whom he disregards?

Trusting in God then, implies a conviction of his goodness, and not only of his goodness in the abstract, but of his tender regard for our individual interests. I have already told you what I mean by putting our trust in God. It is after we have performed our duty, after we have done all we can do, to rest convinced there is one Being, who overlooks creation, who has by his wisdom so ordered it, that our labours shall never be in vain; that, when we do all that human ingenuity can accomplish, though all around may be darkness, through which the eye cannot pierce, though calamity upon calamity may have driven us from the sunshine of prosperity into the shades of wretchedness, though the fig-tree should not blossom, the vines yield no fruit; though the olive should fail and no meat be in the fields, the flocks desert the folds, and no herd be in the stall, we are to rejoice in the Lord, to joy in the God of our salvation. We are to recognize in all this a wisdom at work; a superintending Providence exerting its control to make these discouraging circumstances, these untoward events but the harbingers of a brighter day, the introduction to some good hitherto unknown.

The reasonableness of this confidence is obvious. I will not refer you to books, nor will I attempt to prove it by the *dicta* of other ages, I ask not for precedents, I care not for authority, however respectable—I refer you to the heart. My appeal is to the native undisguised feelings of the human heart, and by their decision will I abide. I would not damp the courage of a fellow being, by dwelling on his weakness, nor repress the ardent aspirations of hope by pointing to the evanescent nature of all sublunary good. But the world is a scene of perpetual change; life is exposed to a thousand cares and anxieties, to a thousand contingencies which we can neither foresee nor prevent when we do; sorrow will steal in upon the heart, and the firmest will at times bend beneath the pressure of grief.

There are moments, there are days, yea months and not unfrequently years, in almost every one's life, when the world has lost its power to charm; when the spirits sink; when the heart becomes vacant; when a tedious and an undefined feeling of lassitude, disgust and depression, usurps the whole man, and renders the mind painfully sensative to the minutest incident that strikes across it. It is then we look eagerly for some arm on which to lean.—The arm of flesh is a broken reed. The world can present nothing which the heart does not reject, or deem unable to support its sinking hopes. Where shall we go? Where find the arm which can uphold?

Often does a dark cloud hang over our prospects and hide from our sight all future good; a thick impervious gloom gathers round the heart—where is the sun-beam to dispel that cloud? Where the light to dissipate that gathering gloom? Look, ye who sigh at your condition, ye who weep over your misfortunes and despair of felicity yet to come, look to God, to that Great Being whose power is every where felt, whose wisdom is every where displayed, and whose goodness is unto all—fly to him, lean on his Almighty arm, light will burst from his throne, the clouds will disperse and the cheerful sun of hope will shine upon the heart.

The thought that nature is but the will of an all-wise, powerful and benevolent Being, gives new force to the mind, inspires it with invincible courage, gives it additional elasticity, which throws off the burthen of wretchedness it had borne, enables it to rise superiour to adversity and to hide the present by drawing upon the exhaustless stores of the future. There are those who say there is no God, those who suppose the world obedient to no hand but stern necessity—I have had such thoughts, but they shot through the heart with pangs too severe to describe, and they seemed to poison the soul and to dry up all the sources of its felicity.—But when those thoughts departed and I felt myself once more in the embrace of the Godhead, encircled by the arms of Divine affection, no argument was wanting to convince me, that man disbelieving in God must be unhappy, and he who can put no trust in the Most High must be miserable indeed.

Man labours neither long nor successfully, when he has no confidence that his labours will be rewarded. When he believes he can accomplish nothing he will not accomplish half he might, had he believed he could and would be successful. Let an army front an opposing one, feeble and disheartened by the conviction it cannot conquer, and you may vouch for its defeat. Its attack will want spirit, and it will fail to prosecute any advantage it may gain. It is the same in every department of life in every thing about which we can be employed. Whatever has a tendency to inspire man with firmness, to give him confidence of succeeding in his exertions, will, not only give him more internal enjoyment, but by the mental force it gives, will enable him to accomplish more than would otherwise have been in his power.

Let an army rush to battle under the full

conviction their cause is espoused by Heaven, and that God will crown their arms with victory; they fight with redoubled force and persevere with the most undaunted resolution.—Let every man be engaged in those employments which, he believes, God will prosper, let man trust in God, and he will go forward with cheerfulness, and exert a power, in his labour, of which he was before unconscious.—With this confidence he rises a more noble being, a higher dignity clothes his countenance; a loftier fire shoots from his eyes; his whole soul becomes enlarged; his thoughts more sublime, and he half imitates the perfections of that God in whom he trusts. Danger is despised: troubles and difficulties give way, and adversity itself becomes but the means of his elevation.

This confidence in God is called a duty and he who has it not, is branded a criminal. It may be so. I call it not a duty, and certainly he who has it not, is sufficiently wretched without being upbraided as guilty. It is not mine to say who is guilty before God. The secret recesses of the heart are closed to my observation, and the criterion by which man is to be declared guilty before his God, is unknown to me. But whoever learns the character of the great Parent of all, as revealed in his works and in his word, *will* feel the confidence required. Whoever contemplates the stupendous display of his loving kindness, made by the Gospel which brings life and immortality to light, to cheer the hearts and dissipate the fears of a long benighted and disconsolate world, will feel the goodness of God, and will not hesitate to trust in his Providence and rejoice in the Lord, yea joy in the God of his salvation.

I need not labour to *enforce* the lessons of my subject, but when I view the loneliness of Zion, mark the desolations of the Church of God, I cannot resist the opportunity, to draw from it arguments to soothe the anxious mind, and to inspire the benevolent heart with courage to persevere in the cause of humanity.

Long has the philanthropist mourned over the folly and credulity of mankind, long has the tear glistened in his eyes, as he surveyed the wide spread ruin of the human race, the spiritual famine and moral pestilence by which they have been consumed, their hopes blasted and themselves doomed to drag out a cheerless existence, unknown to the health of virtue, unsupplied with the bread of life. On every hand we have seen a universal commotion, and from every quarter we have heard a continual buzz—all striving amid the confused din of business to lessen their uneasiness and to increase their enjoyments, and still from every quarter, through every age and in every country is reiterated the question, "who will show us any good?"

Prophets and priests have pretended to give us directions—have seemed confident that if we followed their prescriptions, our maladies should be healed and our souls supplied with bread, with wholesome food. We have listened attentively to their doctrines, we have followed with undeviating accuracy their directions, the evil has not disappeared, the pestilence yet rages and the famine has not abated its fury. The church was established; the spires of Zion rose sublime to the skies. Her lofty walls, her splendid palaces, the rich decoration of her temples, seemed to promise a retreat that would shelter us from the storms of the world, and present whatever could charm the eye.

But the glory of Zion has departed! The Church has been stripped of its beauty and become the sport of every one who passes by.—That splendid city, founded by the Saviour of the world has been deserted, and those institutions which should have been the nursery of virtue and the asylum of the oppressed, which should have healed the broken hearted, comforted the mourner, lightened the heavy laden of their burthens and enabled the weary to find rest to their souls—those institutions, planted as it was said, by the Deity and were the peculiar objects of his care, institutions which were to send peace on earth and good-will to man, have long since been laid in the dust. The temples of pure religion have been demolished and their lofty columns overgrown with moss.

The Empire of Christ, which promised so much felicity to the world, has been over-run by the ruthless invader, its glory has fled before the ravaging Goth, and its peace has vanished in the triumph of barbarous sectaries. A thousand petty communities have been established, and humanity has wept over the bitter wars which they have constantly waged against each other. Religion has been sacrificed to the demon of discord and felicity on earth to a dream of a phantom world.

Many have indeed arisen to humanize the savage hordes, to soothe their animosity, to mollify their rage, to dissipate the clouds which hang over our moral heavens, and to pour in light upon our dark habitation. But they have often fallen a prey to the zeal of those for whose benefit they laboured. A deaf ear has been turned to their lessons, their names branded with reproach and their souls anathematized and sentenced to eternal woe.

And even now, when the human race seem to have survived their downward progress and are beginning to rise in the scale of moral and intellectual worth, the prospects of Zion are deeply shaded with gloom, and it requires no ordinary share of moral courage, to stem the current of popular clamour and of sectarian invective. Even now the benevolent heart is often pained to see how few are the friends of truth! how few can be collected to hear those sentiments which ennoble man and do honour to his Creator! While the temples of discord, of

folly, of superstition and of ancient fraud are crowded almost to excess, the number of those who bow at the shrine of just knowledge, is few and of that number many are timid and half discouraged.

But my brethren, however much we may deplore this state of things, a just confidence in God, bids us not be depressed, by no means to abate the least in our benevolent exertions.—Know, the world is governed by a steady, unerring hand. No lawless tyrant sways the sceptre of Universal empire; no arbitrary misrule reigns in the heavens. A certain ORDER is established. The primordial laws of nature retain their primitive force. These laws fix to every act its due reward. Obey these and man is happy. The reward may often be delayed but it shall come. The labours of virtue shall not be in vain. He who comes forth to enlighten the world, may rely on the Sovereign of the Universe to give effect to his exertions. He may read his success in every law of nature. Knowledge shall prevail over ignorance, honesty over craft, and sincerity over hypocrisy.—Sooner shall nature fail, sooner shall the sun withhold his influence and the planets fly from their orbits, than that virtue shall not be rewarded and philanthropy not receive her recompence.

The time may be long ere the millions of our race, will awake from the stupidity into which the folly of other ages has thrown them. Long may we have to plead with man to be wise.—But if we kindle the fire of intellect, the breath of the Almighty shall fan it to a flame, and its illuminations shall irradiate the world. Though we may not see the full harvest of what we sow, posterity shall—nations yet unborn shall reap the fruit of our labours. We may look down the stream of Time and see generations hereafter to be, influenced by the opinions we form and by the institutions we establish. Every new truth we discover, and every just opinion we inculcate, will be attended by an ever accumulating degree of felicity for those who shall come after us. Away then with despair. Farewell to dejection and to gloomy forebodings. Let us feel the importance of the work we have commenced. Let us rest assured God reigns and that his Providence will protect us, and then we may ever say, "Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall there be fruit in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meats; the flocks shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls; Yet we will rejoice in the Lord, we will joy in the God of our Salvation."

DOWRY.—The best dowry to advance the marriage of a young lady is, when she has in her countenance mildness; in her speech wisdom; in her behaviour modesty; and in her life virtue.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

MR. BROWNSON:

Dear Sir—The manner in which you have been pleased to notice me in the 13th No. of your paper, if allowed to pass without any remark from me, might lead the publick to suppose, that I had been engaged, both publickly and privately, in plotting your ruin; and, that this proceeded from a hostile disposition towards you.

What information you have received by private letters I cannot say—I have spoken to several persons about the course you were pursuing, in plain terms, and without disguise; and what I have said, in the first place originated in the inquiries of others, what I thought of some of the sentiments you advanced. I could not in conscience approve of them, nor could I consistently withhold an answer. But this I aver as the truth, I was silent as long as I could be, compatibly with my feelings.

The 'charges I have preferred publickly,' are no personal charges to you, for the letter you doubtless allude to, which is published in the 2d No. of the Utica Evangelical Magazine, neither mentions your name nor that of your paper. What I have said in that letter, is, I think, fairly deduced from your writings. I designed it as *cautionary*, and meant no evil. This is all I have made publick; and if your notice of me did not call for this communication, it is probably all I should ever have written on the subject.

The letter I wrote Mr. Doubleday, was caused by a fact, which I am confident will not be considered unworthy of notice by yourself.—But that letter was private, and originated in the following circumstance: a worthy patron of the Advocate, and far '*less* timorous than discerning,' who, by his upright deportment, and laudable endeavours to procure the paper read by the opponents of Universalism, made it extensively useful while it was conducted by Br. Everett, informed me, that he did not pretend to put the Advocate into the hands of opposers any more, but used the Religious Inquirer for that purpose. My object in writing to Mr. D. was, to remove this unpleasant embarrassment. This is the sum of my offending.

In entering your columns, which I never should have done on this subject had you not invited it, I hope to be governed by "the meekness of the Gospel, and the candour true philosophy always inspires." But I assure you, sir, that, should I have occasion to write *my creed* before I get through, I shall not urge the necessity of "believing, that *Jonah swallowed the Whale*," or any such "marvellous stories"—nor shall I trouble the reader with the levity you have manifested, on a serious subject.—And if you "will reason the point to the satisfaction of the pious," and prove yourself "*a*

firm believer of the gospel of Christ," I shall feel a satisfaction which I have not experienced for a length of time. I should rejoice at being persuaded, that you are "a firm believer in the Gospel of Christ." But I should regret to have such a believer write and publish what you have. And, sir, if now, on reviewing your Essays and Sermons, I could say I have been mistaken about your sentiments, I should be happy to acknowledge it in the most publick manner.

In this letter, I shall confine myself mainly to what you have written on the existence of God and the inspiration of the scriptures. I am not ambitious to prove you are not "a believer in the Gospel of Christ," but would heartily prefer proving that you are one. And though I shall endeavour to treat you and the subject fairly, I shall not spare where you have betrayed the cause of truth, and apparently aimed at its crucifixion.

You say—"The only kind of inspiration which to me appears rational, is inspiration by *suggestion*."—"The inspired person feels a certain impulse, under the influence of which he speaks. If he feel the impulse of truth, what he says will be true; if the impulse of errour, what he pronounces will be false."—p. 86.

Nothing is here provided to suggest to the mind of the inspired person whether it is a good or a bad being, or *any being*, that gives the impulse; for under its influence he speaks, and he may speak truth or falsehood, by the same spirit, according to the impulse it may give. This is the only guide or ground whereby we are to know whether any part of the bible is inspired or not—that is, on this "attenuated thread" the whole *fact* of inspiration is suspended. You indeed allow of the use of reason to examine *what* is inspired and *what* is not. This is well. But it leaves inspiration, to say the least, very doubtful; and indeed it seems difficult to view it in any other light than as the mere *accidental fancy* of the person acting by *such* an impulse. And alluding to the professed inspiration of the apostles, you say—"Perhaps the testimony of such persons would have weight in a court of law, especially three thousand years after their death, tho' rejected with contempt by their contemporaries!!" But the conclusion you finally arrive at about inspiration is—"The sacred writers were inspired then by a holy spirit, and wrote what such a spirit or DISPOSITION induced them to believe to be correct. I do not call this inspiration *supernatural* but *extraordinary*."—p. 87. The sacred writers appear to have been well disposed men, and, inspired by their *good disposition*, they were prevented from "falling into *known* or *wilful* errours"—We have many persons among us, inspired in the same way now. But how do you arrive at the conclusion, that these holy men were enabled "to do and say what they never would have thought, and what none would ever have conceived under any other circumstances whatever," unless it is merely, that, being inspired by a *good disposition*, they were better *circumstanced* (as all good men are now) to *desire* to do good, and speak truth, *if they could only know what it was*. This spirit prevented them from falling into *known* or *wilful* errours. This spirit is possessed by every truly good man now.—You say—"I do not call this inspiration *supernatural* but extraordinary." It truly is not supernatural, *nor is it even extraordinary:* for it has been quite common in all ages, and, in some degree, in all countries. And, if the world has improved, we have more of this kind of inspiration now, and, perhaps, in as high state of perfection and cultivation as it has ever been possessed in any former period. But if inspiration be *not supernatural*, it is not "*above nature*," nor "*above the course of nature*." And if it be not *beneath* nature, it is *natural*, or it is nothing. On your ground, then, should I adopt the whole, I would say—"I can see nothing in nature nor in revelation that appears able to originate the idea of a God in my mind, because inspiration is not *supernatural*, but *natural*, or a part of nature."—This is the highest round of your theory of inspiration. You, of all other men, have need to believe in supernatural inspiration. For if nature cannot originate the idea of a God to your mind, nothing else that you are in possession of can, for it is the only inspiration you admit, and hence you have nothing but *nature* for your guide, yourself being witness.

Inspiration is not so much on your ground of argument, as you have called it. You say it is *extraordinary*. But does this make it so? Truly, sir, you have made it out a very *common* thing. The spirit that inspires, is only a *holy* or *good disposition*, "the governing power of the mind," which prompts the inspired person with a wish to benefit his brethen, by telling them the truth, and keeps him from falling into *known* or *wilful* errours (this is not very extraordinary) but leaves him unable to trace the origin of discoveries beyond his own holy spirit, or *disposition* to tell the truth, because there is nothing supernatural in it. If you believe in a God, what has originated the idea of his existence! Nature has not, because it could not; yet you call it *wonderful*. You say you take your belief from the scriptures. But revelation is deficient, for according to your own telling, it is only *natural*, exceedingly *common*, and can neither be *wonderful* nor *extraordinary*. A person inspired in this way could not learn there is a God without learning it from *nature*, for you allow of nothing else. An Atheist may possess this good disposition, or *holy spirit*, be inspired in the same way, and be prevented "from falling into *known* or *wilful* errours."—And yet the holy spirit would not reveal to him the idea of a God. He would be still an

Atheist. But if you believe in a God, *what* is he? He must "be nature or a part of nature. This is the same as Atheism." This conclusion is inevitable. For by putting the most favourable construction on your language that I can, and I wish to do so, I cannot discover, nay, your words deny, that you believe in any inspiration adequate to reveal the existence of God if *nature* cannot, because you admit of no higher principle than *nature* by which men can be inspired. And though you call it *extraordinary*, your arguments on that subject show that it is not. But, sir, however common you have made the subject of inspiration, there are many things *in nature* that are truly extraordinary. Now the whole seems resolved into this: Some persons under the impulse of "a holy spirit or disposition" as "the governing power of their minds," said there must be a God that made the universe. But how did they come by this notion? Not in a "*supernatural*" *way*, but either by accident, or by "the course of nature," though it was an extraordinary discovery. Those who heard this suggestion announced, began to look around them, and concluded, it must be so, because reason did not contradict it. That is all. *Nature* inspired them, or they spake by accident, and without design.

The high and enthusiastick tone in which you speak of the voice of nature being the word of God—"so loud that the deaf may almost hear—so *plain* the *fool* may understand—so sweet, the stupid and the insensible must admire"--plain without "interpreters" or "teachers," and captivating without "persuasion," makes it evident, that you are extremely negligent, or hold out appearances to deceive your readers.

What must a discerning reader think of the following sentiments taken from your writings:

1. That "Man, wherever beheld, NO MATTER IN WHAT AGE *or in what country*, recognizes an over-ruling Power on whom he is dependent, and to whom he believes himself to owe allegiance."—p. 9.

2. That you can see nothing in nature that appears able to originate the idea of a God in your mind.

3. That, to *originate* such an idea is the business of inspiration. And,

4. That you consider only as inspired, the doctrinal part of the New Testament or of the Christian scriptures.

If a reconciliation can be effected here, it will require greater powers of inspiration than you have inculcated, or allowed to the sacred writers or to any other being. Did you mean to be understood, that the *doctrinal parts* of the NewTestament were inspired and made known to the Jewish prophets, and, that Jesus and his apostles *recognized* those doctrines, and *selected* them as *Christian in their day*? You cannot take this ground without contradicting your views of inspiration, and other statements you have made, nor without disallowing of inspiration to Christ and his apostles. Yet this is the only ground you can take, and make it appear even possible, that 'Man,' *in any age before the Christian*, 'recognized a God or an over-ruling Power on whom he was dependent or to whom he owed allegiance.' Look at it candidly, sir, and if you will say you would be an Atheist for all that *nature* could originate, it is certain you must be an Atheist for any thing *your* inspiration can do, (for it is only *natural*) or you must believe without evidence, which you would not like to admit. But I will leave these clashing statements for you to solve in the light of your own faith.

I will observe however, that no credit can be given to the doctrinal part of the New Testament, if the prophetick part of the old be not inspired. The sacred historian of the Christian scriptures, says, "For this is he (John) of whom the prophet Isaiah speaketh in these words: 'The voice of one proclaiming in the wilderness, prepare a way for the Lord, make for him a straight passage." Isai. xl. 3. Mark and Luke cite the same passage in speaking of John, Mark i. 2—Luke iii. 4. "Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise FORETOLD of these days." Acts, iii. 24. Jesus himself, speaking of John, says, "For this is he concerning whom it is written, Behold I send mine angel before thee who shall prepare thy way—and if ye will bear to be told it, *this is the Elijah that was to come*."—See Matt. xi. 10, 14. Mal. iii. 1, and iv. 5.—If you admit the truth of these declarations of Christ and the Evangelists, you will find your kind of inspiration inadequate, unless you contend, that events of this description were foretold in the same way we calculate an eclipse; and moreover, you will have to grant, that the Jewish prophets were inspired in a supernatural manner. For if this be not so, it is a fact, which cannot be disguised, that Jesus, the Apostles and Evangelists were *deceived themselves*, or they acted a *grossly dishonest part in deceiving others*. For they all have recourse to the Old Testament, and recognize the sayings of the prophets as predictions calculated *for*, and *fulfilled in*, the beginning of the Christian age.

You have given a pledge to prove yourself "a firm believer in the Gospel of Christ." I sincerely hope you will do it, for the honour of the cause implied by the title of your paper. But this you have yet to do. For if you assert a thousand times, that you believe in the existence of a God and the inspiration of the doctrinal part of the New Testament, and your premises deny this assertion, you must either be credulous (a charge which you would be the last to own) or uncandid. You tell us, that the existence of God is *evident* to every one

who will use his *senses* and exert his *understanding* (*natural gifts*) and at the same time, that nature can *prove nothing separate from herself.* In the same essay you tell us, that you *know* how the Universe came because revelation has informed you—and that nature is wonderful because we do *not know* how it came.—You say you believe in a God—whose word is no *mysterious sound*, no *unintelligible jargon*—(and this two, while you are zealously descanting on *nature.*) Yet "whether the mighty energy, the mysterious power which pervates the whole of nature and enables the Universe to perform its various and ever-varying phenomina, be a Being *separate* from matter or *inherent* in it; whether it *produced* and *arranged* the vast machine or be the *result* or *aggregate* of all the laws by which matter is actuated; whether it acts by *intelligence* or a *blind necessity*—are questions which baffle all our powers to answer, and which is the correct, man cannot by all the faculties *nature* has given him, ever ascertain." p. 21. What then has or can determine this to the satisfaction of any person, if there be no *super*natural inspiration? Nothing! and here are difficulties, sir, which lie at the very threshold of your work, which many a sincere Christian would be glad to see removed out of the way, and which you must remove, before you can prove yourself a 'firm believer' in that Gospel which recognizes an *intelligent God* as its author.

I am persuaded, that no man can help, and should not be blamed for his honest sentiments. And though before you united with the Presbyterians you were an *avowed Atheist;* and though but a few months before you took the management of the Advocate you renounced a belief in the scriptures (and must have been an Atheist again unless *nature* appeared more *brilliant* at that time) yet, I should be the last to attach any blame for all that. And I now solemnly declare, that I should never have opened my lips on this unpleasant subject, if many *prominent parts* of your writings did not show, that your sentiments have undergone but very little if any change for the better.

I here repeat, I am not ambitious to prove you an unbeliever, and from my soul I regret, that what I have said was called for. And if you will, logically and candidly redeem your pledge, you and your paper shall have my cordial support. Yours, &c. W. I. REESE.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

TO JAMES LUCKEY.—NO. 4.

DEAR SIR—Owing to the multiplicity of my engagements I have delayed answering your last longer than I intended. I avail myself of the first leisure I have to atone for my neglect. In my last I intimated that my next would exhibit the direct scriptural proofs of the salvation of all men, but in my interview with you at my house, you thought I did not treat your letters with sufficient attention. I am sorry sir, I have given you any reason to complain. You shall have no cause to reiterate that complaint. For I will now attend to what you have offered.

I am pleased to find you saying in your last that you "wish to be open to conviction, and to treat this subject with that dignity the concerns of eternity demand." This is well. Unless a man is willing to be convinced, logick is spent in vain upon him. Your favourite poet will tell you,

> "A man convinced against his will,
> Is of the same opinion still."

I know little about the "concerns of eternity" consequently may unwittingly transgress the "dignity" they demand, but I hope I shall always observe that dignity which a love of truth always inspires.

I told you that in the question before us it was necessary to consider each individual a distinct and separate creation. I gave my reasons. You have very easily disposed of the position. You had only to say, "with a moments reflection, you will not wonder if I should manifest more surprise at this assertion of yours than you did at my disposition to destroy evil, for it is certainly most absurd." Sir, I admire the facility of your logick, you reason with unequalled despatch, but if it were seasoned with a little proof it would be more acceptable to my taste.

"It strikes me forcibly," you say, "that we should take things as they are." Very well, we find evil as one of the things which are. Evil is not a characteristick of good, and the being which produces it knowingly is bad. God according to your views is the Author of "the things which are" consequently of evil, now if you do not look to its termination, how will you maintain the absolute goodness of God? You may *say* he is good, and if your mode of argument be correct it will be argument enough.

You say "it remains with me to show that God's administration will be changed." I beg your pardon, as that is a position I have never assumed, and as I maintain the reverse, I think it would be ungenerous to compel me to prove it. For that would require me to prove your side of the question as well as my own.—Remember "we must take things as they are." You say the government of God will not be changed. Now it is very evident, man here is a progressive being and that God gives him the means of salvation, I have the right therefore to infer man will always have the means of salvation within his reach, at least, it remains with you to show they will ever be taken away.

You say I "infer God's administration will be changed." I am sorry Sir to insinuate your memory failed you in this instance. I happen never to have made such a statement, on your account Sir I regret I neglected it. You say my "whole creed depends on my notions of right and wrong" or of "what would be right and wrong in an infinite God." And will you tell me on *whose* notions of right and wrong your creed depends? Surely Sir, I know not what alternative you can have, you must take either your own notions or

the notions of another, and will you blame me because I prefer my own.

You seem to think it very unsafe and very absurd to rely on conclusions which our "corrupt natures and ignorant minds may tell us is right or wrong." I regret Sir, we have nothing better to rely on. If you know of any thing which can draw conclusions but "our corrupt natures and ignorant minds" I would thank you for some information. But you say what is "right or wrong in a God." Now I have been so foolish as to suppose *right* is right the world over. I affix to this term a definite idea. When one tells me God will do *right*, I understand the expression. When one tells me God *will* do so, I say I do not know whether he will or not but I say he *will* if he does *right*, so of wrong.

You also seem afraid of such conclusion because your ignorance of the "government of God" is so great you cannot tell "what is right or wrong in reference to that government." Great as your "ignorance" is, will you not tell us, it is right for God to punish the wicked eternally? or do you not pretend to determine whether it is right or wrong for him thus to punish?

You also say "facts make you afraid to trust your hopes of salvation on *this* (?) hypothesis! Very well I hope you will rest upon the rock of ages, though you may think your *ignorance* too great to look for it.—Your next *fear* arises from a shadow, for the position before which you tremble is a creation of your own fancy—I disown it.

The poetry you have quoted is very fine, but the author of it understood making rhymes better than ethicks or theology. You "protest against reasoning from our notions of right and wrong against the government of God." I suppose Sir, you would have us reason without *any* notions of right and wrong? No doubt were we to do this your notions of theology would be as *reasonable* as any other. But you add "God can and does govern, with reference to the 'general good' of all his creatures." I thank you for this statement. Allow this to be true, and I have no disposition to reason against the government of God, nor even against yourself. It cannot be for your "general good" to be made endlessly miserable, nor for the "general good" of any other creature. "God governs with reference to the general good of *all* his creatures," all then must receive more happiness than misery from their creation. This, Sir, is all for which I have contended. Sir, be on your gard, you may become a Universalist before you are aware of it.

You seem to think "we should not place too high an estimation upon ourselves as *individuals* when weighed in the ballance of the whole." Very good advice; but what is the whole but an aggregate of individuals? And if the interest of the individuals be disregarded, how much attention is paid to the interest of the whole. I do not suppose that an individual is all in all. But I do suppose that God in the multiplicity of his affairs, will not become so confused as to neglect any individual. He pays the same attention to every individual as he would, had that individual been the only one created. As very well expressed by Pope in the following lines which you have furnished me though applied as if in refutation of yourself.

"Who sees with *equal* eye as God of all,
A *hero* perish or a *sparrow* fall;
Atoms or systems into ruin hurled,
And now a *bubble* burst and now a world."

With regard to what you say of "Annanias and Sapphira," I wish you to inform me where was the *justice* in killing them if they received no benefit from being killed? You ask me "with what propriety do the scriptures call the punishment of the wicked the *curse* of the divine law." Not recollecting the passages of scripture to which you refer, I reserve my answer until you produce them. You wish to know "if that can be a *curse* which is the only *effectual* thing that Almighty Wisdom can devise to *prepare* the finally impenitent for happiness?" I should think not. If my creed be true you say "the sinner will enjoy a much more effectual means of salvation in hell than ever he did on earth." Suppose he does, have you any objections? I think you ought rather rejoice at the prospect that he who was incorrigible here, will be reformed hereafter. Certainly I discover nothing in this which should pain a good christian, do you? But this is merely gratuitous. I have never said any thing about sinners being reformed in hell, and certainly did not know it was a part of my creed till you thus informed me.

But you seem troubled to ascertain how, if punishment terminate in good, it can be called a "*curse*."—Now suppose you should drop that term and admit man never was *cursed* what would be the harm? A command I think was once given to this effect. "Bless and curse not." Let us obey the command. You think the "plan of redemption" more fully illustrates the glory of God than creation. It may be so, though I know not what that has to do with this controversy. "But according to my hypothesis it is reserved for hell-fire to eclipse the whole." This is something new to me. And you are confident that "when the celestial beings bring forth the headstone and some are crying grace, grace, unto it, others will cry, fire, fire? This Sir, will remind us of a Methodist Camp Meeting scene, and do you think a recollection of one of those scenes will be unpleasant to you in another world?

"But seriously, I appeal to every unprejudiced mind with what kind of propriety, hell-fire or any punishment which is necessarily inflicted on the wicked, can be called a *curse*, so long as it is not only necessary, but absolutely essential to their eternal happiness?" Seriously then, "I would also appeal to every unprejudiced mind with what kind of propriety" a God of love, who "governs with reference to the 'general good' of *all* his creatures" can be supposed to "curse" any of those for whose 'general good' he governs!

You say you "have never seen an answer to the declaration our Lord made to Judas that would weigh one straw in the scale of *common sense*." Alas for the credit of the Methodist commentator, "the greatest Divine" as you once told me, "in the world," the really erudite Dr. Adam Clark. He has given a long dissertation on this subject, and had he always been as judicious and as correct he might have justified your eulogium. But this passage will avail you nothing.—

Dare you say the sinner who repents of his sins, will not be saved? Presuming you will not deny what you profess to believe, and what may be so easily proved, it is enough to say Judas repented and threw from him the wages of iniquity. To the particular passage you have quoted, "It had been good for that man had he never been born," I reply it was a *proverbial* expression, common to the Jews in our Saviour's time and means nothing more than that the person of whom it is spoken will be exposed to some great and severe evil. This is abundantly proved by your own commentator, Dr. A. Clarke, and consequently need not be labored by me.

If this does not satisfy you, answer me the following queries. Judas was indeed one that was lost, but Jesus came to seek and to save that which was lost, will he find Judas? Christ said to his disciples, Judas being one, hereafter "ye shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Will Jesus perform his promise? If he does, will Judas remain eternally in hell? I shall dismiss your letter, with only a slight remark, you have said much about "hell" and hell-fire. I do not wonder at this. It is the principal ingredient in your creed, and makes the principal theme for all the declamation for which your preachers stand pre-eminent. Do not misunderstand me. I look upon the Methodists as I do upon all other denominations who embrace the notion of endless misery, as being sometimes pretty good people, but defending a most shameful creed. You will remember in your future letters that I am not a "hell-fire" preacher, and therefore it will be unnecessary to attribute the notion to me.

I wish you to take my views from my own writings. I am not accountable for the sins of others, nor are their virtues to be attributed to me. I shall hereafter proceed with my direct proof of the doctrine of Universal salvation and notice your objections as you present them. You will have the goodness to review your last letter, and point out wherever I may have done you injustice. Yours, &c.

O. A. Brownson.

MR. REESE'S LETTER.

Towards the writer of the letter in to-day's Advocate, signed W. I. Reese, we profess no other sentiments than those of friendship and ardent desire for his prosperity and usefulness in the cause of truth and humanity. We respect his talents, his virtues and his indefatigable industry. We rejoice to hear his labours in the place of his residence, are eminently blessed, to the spread of that doctrine, and to the building up of that cause, which we hold dear and which we believe is calculated to promote the best interests of the human race.

It is true we think Mr. Reese has a little too much of the *leaven* of orthodoxy, that his mental vision in some respects is enveloped by a misty atmosphere, and that he is too tender, or has too much sensibility, on some speculative points of polemical theology. Our readers may discover some warmth of feeling in the letter he has addressed us. They may, perhaps, discover some expressions and some charges, which persons, not skilled in sectarian controversy, might deem rather inconsistent with the "meekness of the Gospel and the candour true philosophy always inspires," and some things which are not dissimilar to *personal* abuse.—But they must not be too hard upon one who not having argument, truth nor reason on his side, chooses to let off his battery at the *person* of his opponent, rather than to be beaten or to fail of gaining his cause. Every thing of this kind, we hope, our readers will attribute to our friend's abhorrence of every species of Infidelity and to his laudable zeal for the Gospel of Christ.

His letter has made us look ridiculous enough, but we shall not mind the garb so far as it is personal. We will simply tell him, it will not be necessary for him to write Mr. Doubleday to correct the matter of the Advocate. The Editor is responsible for what appears in our paper, and if any one is dissatisfied with what it contains, he is to be blamed, and not Mr. Doubleday. We can but smile at the insinuation we are "betraying" the cause of Christ, and while we are conscious of our honesty (*honesty* being the first article in our creed,) we shall not trouble ourself at friend Reese's charge of *dishonesty*; and we strongly suspect that if we had been *less* honest we should have been less censured.

The letter labours with some art, with some zeal and less plausibility to fasten upon us the charge of Atheism. This charge is supported in the following manner: First, we reduce the standard of *inspiration* too low, or we admit only a *natural* inspiration. Second. If our standard of inspiration is correct, we do not admit enough of the bible to be inspired. Third. We deny *nature* is able to teach the existence of God, that being taught only by *revelation*. Therefore we must be an Atheist; for if nature does not teach his existence, and there be only a *natural* inspiration, then certainly we have no evidence of the existence of God, and if we believe, we must be very credulous—a charge he thinks we should not be willing to admit.—And so we think.

This statement, we believe, contains the full force of Mr. Reese's objections. If we remove this he must withdraw his charge, as we doubt not he will be ready to do. Since we received his letter we have reviewed all our articles to which exceptions are taken, and find them all to be parts of unfinished discussions. Perhaps had our friends waited a little longer their uneasiness would have been removed. And, for the life of us, we cannot perceive why our friends should have been alarmed. We have uniformly encouraged free enquiry, we have insisted upon our readers examining for themselves, and that they should abide the convictions of their own minds. Now had they be-

lieved that "errour is harmless when reason is free to combat it," they would not have *cried*, even if we had advanced some erroneous notions.

We have an objection—a strong objection to Mr. R.'s mode of argument. It is crushing us with the might of authority, silencing our voice by the *dicta* of other times. He calls not in question the correctness of our statements, he presume not to accuse us of misstating a single *fact*; it is only our opinions are supposed by him to be contradictory to each other, and to a certain notion which somebody has believed. It is not enough to tell us such a sentiment contradicts the bible, or disproves the existence of God; but is that sentiment true? Is it based on fact? If it be it is enough: no matter what it contradicts. He who cannot say so, he who will deny fact, or labour to explain it away, is more in love with his own opinions than he is with truth.

Mr. Reese, unintentionally we presume, has taken a very ungenerous ground with us. There is no way except a man's own declaration, by which you can ascertain what is his belief: now this we are denied. For, though we should "assert a thousand times we believe in God," it seems we are not to be credited. It is a matter of wonder, Mr. Reese should believe us to be an Atheist upon so slight evidence as our own declaration. We have asserted time after time that we believed in the existence of God, and we never have, to our knowledge, used a single expression which implies any thing different. Candour would take us at our profession, and charitably conclude if our premises involved a denial of the existence of God, we were not aware of the consequences.

But our premises, it is supposed, lead to Atheism. What are these premises? Nature does not teach the existence of God. Revelation teaches his existence. Inspiration is an extraordinary impulse which enabled the sacred writers to do and to say what none others ever did or ever could have done under other circumstances. Only the doctrinal parts of the New Testament are inspired, because the Old is most superceded by the New. Therefore we do not believe in the existence of God. Now this to us is no reason at all, and unless a man be *inspired* he can perceive no connection between the premises and the conclusion. For ourself we should think there was as much probability of discovering the philosopher's stone as of finding any.

But we will bear with our friend. He shall have "line upon line, and precept upon precept." The premises shall be examined in detail. First of inspiration. The question now is, not what is inspiration, but what have we laid it down to be. "A suggestion to the mind of a person, made by a holy spirit in not a supernatural, but an extraordinary manner. The person inspired feels a certain impulse which enables him to do & to say what he never could have done under any other circumstances."

This is the view we have given in our essays on inspiration. By "holy spirit" we understand holy power, or energy in general, but more particularly the power, energy or spirit, by which Christ and his apostles performed their miracles. The sacred writers it is commonly supposed were inspired by the Holy Ghost. By the "Holy Ghost" Mr. Reese understands the "holy doctrine of Christ." (see his controversy with A, Gospel Adv. vol. 5.) And, we understand by it, that holy energy which God gave in an extraordinary manner to his Son and to the apostles. By *this* we supposed them to be inspired. Mr. Reese must suppose they were inspired by the "holy doctrine of Christ." Our readers may determine which exalts inspiration the most.

But we do not "call inspiration supernatural, but extraordinary." True: and because not knowing the full extent of nature we were diffident about pronouncing a thing *above* nature. Second. Because, though the power which governed the mind of the inspired might be supernatural, we believed the knowledge was communicated through the medium of the natural organs. That is, the men who "spoke as they were moved" were natural men, men like others, subject to the same frailties, liable to the same errours as others, only as they were preserved by this extraordinary influence. Now as we did not profess to understand exactly the process, we used the term *extraordinary*, as being a more indefinite term than supernatural, and consequently admitting a greater latitude of meaning. Third. Because the word extraordinary may mean as much as the other term, or at least we have been in the habit of using it in the same sense which many do the word supernatural. The Christian world, for three or four hundred years quarrelled about a single diphthong: we do not intend to follow that example. Mr. R. may use the term supernatural if he pleases. We have never said we believed it improper. We have only said we preferred another term. The one we preferred means *out of the ordinary mode*; and in the place we used it, means that the sacred writers did not receive their knowledge as other men do. But, in an extraordinary manner, by the influence of *a* (or *the*) holy spirit, which suggested to their minds what to say. Mr. Reese says this is *natural*: it may be so. Let him prove it is natural. We know nothing in nature like it. We have never seen any one inspired in this manner. If Mr. Reese has he may bring forward the facts—we will listen.

2nd. The second objection is that we do not admit *enough* of the bible is inspired. Mr. Reese says, in a letter, published in the 2nd No. of the Evangelical Magazine—a letter designed as *cautionary* to ourself, that he "knows

of no Universalist who believes every word of the Bible to be inspired." Mr. R. professes to be a Universalist, consequently he does not believe the whole to be inspired: now we may both be wrong. But that is nothing to the present discussion. The only difference between Mr. Reese and ourself on this point, is that we do not believe quite so many words are inspired in a book, which he admits is not all inspired, as he does. If Mr. R. can say the bible contains ten uninspired words and still be a believer in the book, shall we be denied that appellation because we think it very probable it contains a dozen words which were not inspired? Mr. R. admits a part of the bible is inspired. So do we. He exercises his judgement as to which part that is, may not we do the same?

But Mr. R. says we "must admit the prophetical writings." We have said nothing about these. We said in our Essay, "as the doctrinal parts of the Old Testament are mostly superceded by the New, we *consider* as inspired only the doctrinal parts of the New Testament." What were our reasons? Because the old was false? By no means. But because the old had been mostly superceded by the new. The old is like a law repealed. It is no longer inforce. The Christian scriptures are an improved edition of the Jewish; and to us it seems no mark of wisdom, to cling to that which is confessedly imperfect, when that which is perfect is come. The old doubtless contains truth, many notices of the revelation of God, but the new testament must be consulted to find which the parts are, for the old has no authority except sanctioned by the new. This is what we have uniformly taught on this subject.

But the prophets.—We confess our inability to understand a prophet's language. Their words no doubt have meaning—very important meaning, but we know not what it is. But as most Divines admit the event must determine the prophecy, and not the prophecy the event, we shall leave all prophecies to the events to be ascertained by them whether true or false. It is said the principal use of prophecy is after the event, that we recognize in its fulfilment the wisdom of the Being who predicted. The passages from the prophets, cited by Mr. Reese, doubtless mean what he says, but it required the inspiration of the New Testament to discover it. Our dull sense would never have dreamed of any such similitude had not a voice from heaven thus proclaimed; and unless that voice is again heard we dare not flatter ourselves we shall be able to understand the enigmas of the prophets. Mr. R. may understand them. It is well: we would that we did, but we do not. Perhaps we are not *spiritually* discerned.

But, let this pass. Mr. R.'s principal objection arises from the supposed fact, to admit no more than we do, is inspired, prevents us from maintaining the existence of a God. But this objection is slight. Were the bible destroyed, the evidence of the existence of a God would remain, and that too without admitting nature can teach his existence. Had we asserted that none of the bible was inspired, Mr. R. could not have proved us an Atheist, even from our own premises. This will soon appear.

3d. Mr. R. alleges that we assert *nature* cannot teach the idea of God. We do: that is to us, to our mind, though we do not deny that it may to others. But Mr. R. has also quoted some passages from our Essays which seem to assert that nature *can* teach the existence of God. We need not repeat the passages. One set of passages assert nature cannot teach the existence of *God*, the other that nature does teach the existence of "some Mysterious Power, some Mighty Energy which prevades the whole, and enables the universe to present its various and ever-varying phenomena." But is there not a contradiction here? None. By the term God we understand a Being separate from nature, intelligent, independent, who originated nature and exerts a voluntary control over it. By the power or energy which expressions we use, we mean nothing more than the great active principle we every where see exerted. This power is indeed God, but nature could not teach us that fact, nature cannot teach his personality and his voluntary control over the universe. This distinction is important. We may have produced some ambiguity by not having always regarded it. This mighty Power or Energy is taught by nature, and every Atheist may admit it. But, the other ideas, which we believe are essential to the term GOD, as all Theists understand the term, we teach are learned not from nature, but from revelation.

But we say, "man wherever beheld no matter in what age or what country, recognizes an Overruling Power on whom he is dependent, and to whom he believes himself to owe allegiance." True, and we mean man in every age and in every country of the world, believes in the existence of God. We believe this, not in the sense which nature may be said to teach a sort of philosophical God, but in the sense in which revelation teaches his existence. But we admit "only the doctrinal parts of the New Testament are inspired." True. But the above assertion teaches the belief of a God was in the world before the New Testament was written. True, and we believe also before the old was written. How shall we reconcile this? Very simply.

We have no where taught we are dependent on *inspiration* for our ideas of God, but on revelation. The theological notions of the Bible, whether you speak of the new or of the old, are older than the book in which they

are written; and we would not be supposed such a consummate fool as to say man in every age believed in God, and yet the idea of a God was never in the world till the time of Jesus Christ. Now in our vocabulary the bible and revelation aro not synonymous terms. We consider revelation a communication made from God to man, and made in the early ages of the world. Being made before the dispersion of mankind, it was easily carried with them as they wandered from each other, and thus became spread over the earth. The sacred books of all nations exhibit some traces of it, though the most pure and authentick accounts of it are found in the Jewish and Christian scriptures. The doctrinal parts of the New Testament teach what this revelation was. Here our friend Reese will learn the revelation which teaches us the existence of God. But as this revelation became corrupted by all nations, so that it was nearly useless, about two thousand years ago, God sent his own Son and his disciples to separate what was true from what was false, and to tell us plainly what is truth. This is found in the New Testament. Hence this is the book which we consider as inspired or as authoritative. The old contains much truth; the sacred books of the Hindoos and of the ancient Persians also contain much truth; but the Christian scriptures teach us to separate what is true from what is false in those books.

Our reasons for admitting this early revelation, are 1. The early notices we find of a Being denominated God. These notices could not have been learned from nature alone. 2. If we say the idea of God is not derived from a contemplation of nature, we must say it is either a self evident proposition or else it is taught by revelation. If we say nature teaches it we supersede the necessity of revelation, but for revelation Mr. Reese contends as well as we. If we say it is a self evident proposition, we must say that it cannot be doubted. For no one can doubt a self evident proposition. But this is doubted as Mr. R. will admit, for he supposes we are of the number who doubt. This therefore cannot be admitted. We must then say it was taught by revelation, and none later than the one we have supposed will meet the exigencies of the case.

3. Because the identity of all religions point to a common origin, even in those particulars which all competent judges admit are not taught by nature. 4. Because all Divines whether ancient or modern, with whom we are acquainted admit, and not only admit, but contend for this early revelation. And, 5 because deny us this, and we shall renounce our faith in Christianity, or in its being a divine institution. Every moral precept and every doctrinal sentiment found in the New Testament, is older than the Christian era by hundreds of years, and many of them older than the oldest book in the old testament itself. Now deny these sentiments were taught by an early revelation, you deny the Christian doctrines were taught by revelation. All admit the Christian doctrines are amply sufficient. If these were all learned without inspiration, what, let us ask, was the necessity of any revelation at all?

Our views on this subject are now given. We think they are easily reconciled. We have taught, first, Nature cannot originate the idea of God in our minds. 2. Revelation assures us there is a God. 3. This revelation was made in the infancy of the world by our heavenly Father to his children. 4. Only the doctrinal parts of the New Testament are inspired, consequently the only safe authority for determining what the original revelation taught. 5. Inspiration is a certain impulse given to the mind, by a holy spirit, power or energy, or the holy spirit by which Christ performed his miracles. This holy spirit breathes into or suggests to the minds of the inspired, what to say, and the inspired persons spoke what the "governing power of their minds," or the particular frame or "*disposition*" of their minds determined. These five positions harmonize with each other. And we are ready to defend any of them or all of them. But this we are not yet called upon to do. We mean to be always ready to give a reason of the hope that is in us to every one that shall ask.

We trust what we have said will convince our readers that we may be a firm believer in the Gospel of Christ notwithstanding Mr. R's. formidable objections. We suppose our readers to have some mind for themselves. We have not descended into every minutiæ as though we were dissecting musquito bills. We have given general principles, which we intend to carry out in detail as we progress with our paper. We claim no exemption from the common frailties of our race, nor do we ask any extraordinary indulgence. We have professed the Christian religion, and we advocate it as we understand it. If we understand it wrong then show us our errour, and not at first brand us Infidel or Atheist. For ourself we despise these cant appellations, and were none but ourself concerned we should be ashamed to attempt to show them misapplied.

We are aware of the feelings of Universalists. We know very well they have a sensativeness peculiar to those who consider themselves the minority. We know they tremble at almost every sentiment which is advanced lest the orthodox gain some advantage over them. Hence they often treat with extreme illiberality the most deserving, because the most honest and independent, of their preachers. They do this not because they dislike the sentiments advanced but because they fear somebody else will. We often meet with this and we just as often despise it. We were born free, we have maintained our freedom, and when we cannot, we will pray we may no longer live.

Mr. R. says he does not "*blame* us for our sentiments." We are very glad he does not. It might be mortifying indeed to be blamed by him. He is no doubt sincere in this, but if he has ever thought as far, he would doubtless with Dean Swift, tell us to keep our opinion to ourself. Duly grately for this liberality in friend Reese, we must assure him it never once occurred to us, when writing the articles in question or when forming our sentiments to enquire whether we should become obnoxious to his blame or praise. He will pardon us for this oversight.

Mr. R. says we were once "an avowed Atheist." This is something new to us, but he doubtless knows, and if he can make our readers believe we were once an Atheist it will help him very much to make them believe we are one now. He is welcome to all he can gain by this. We will tell him we were once a Presbyterian and that we consider worse than Atheism. But we are not now, and we feel not ashamed to acknowledge ourself wiser to-day than we were yesterday. He says too we "renounced our belief in the scriptures a few months before we became the editor of the Advocate." Mr. R. however is not anxious to prove we are not a believer in Christianity. He then did not state this for that purpose. O no. It was only to make the publick believe we are dishonest. Suppose it was so, what then? Is that a certain argument we do not believe now? Our religious faith is between us and our God, and we have formed it too, after long and painful research, and while clothed with the mantle of our own conscious integrity, we shall not start at such feeble missiles from him. Yet we think the venom of the shaft exceeds the vigour of the bow.

CHURCH AND STATE.—No. 2.

Some time since we published an article, under the above head, and promised to remark still further upon the subject, as we should find leisure. We have been prevented from continuing our remarks for the want of room, but we will assure our readers and our orthodox friends generally, that we have not, and probably shall not abandon the subject.

We have already stated that we did not think a *union* of Church and State, the particular object of clerical ambition, that they aimed at a higher object, designing to make the state *bow* to the church and statesmen obey the dictation of priests. The Presbyterian would revolt at the idea of being a Presbyterian if the law compelled him to be one; and should this government ever make the requisition, he would exhibit all the turbulence of John Knox, and for aught we know, the unconquerable rebellion of his Cameronean ancestors. But the Presbyterian while free to embrace what religion he pleases for himself, has never shown himself unwilling to *force* his religion upon others. He doubtless would have no objection, that government should give him the means to render contemptible all who do not choose to adopt his faith.

The measures which have been adopted are of a dangerous character.—Measures which if not soon overthrown, will one day doom our much loved country, to experience the sad reverses which have blackened the history of all others. Of all crafts priest-craft is the most subtle in its designs, the most successful in its measures, and the most dreadful in its influence.

The history of the past should warn the present. Saul the first and best of the Kings of Israel, was opposed, was branded with reproach, lost his kingdom and his life merely because he did not choose to be a tool of the priests of his nation. David, a king unprincipled and pusillanimous, an adulterer and a murderer, was raised to his throne and supported on it, pronounced a man after God's own heart, for no other known virtue, than devotion to the Priest. The whole history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah clearly demonstrate the danger of an overgrown and ambitious priesthood. They oppressed the people. Plotted with the enemies of the nations, and were seldom unable to have the nation conquered by some petty neighbour. They screened themselves from indignation by saying God was angry because they went after idols and therefore *sold* them into the power of their enemies to be punished. There is no doubt they were *sold*, and just as little that the priests took care to secure the *price*.

The Christian Church started without any patronage of State. At first, weak, it depended on divine protection and the force of persuasion. But not contented with this, they soon organized themselves into a separate government, formed a sort of republick, governed by their bishops. Organizing their body more artfully, cementing it more firmly, and concentrating its power, they were at length enabled to place at their head the Emperor of Rome, and to have their religion established as the religion of the Empire. Under Constantine the Church triumphed, but the triumph of the Church was the downfall of the Empire. The Emperours turned bishops, invaded with impunity the few rights left the people, and neglected the welfare of their subjects to settle the question, either by the arguments of reason or the sword, whether Christ was of the *same* or a *like* substance with the Father? With bishops for their ministers and ecclesiasticks for counsellors they hastened the dark ages which hung with horrid night over the world.

What are we doing now? Our clergy are at work. They have a government *separate* from the State. They have disciplined or are disciplining their followers, amassing vast funds, which they hold independent of the

State, they are preparing a powerful army, under skillful leaders, and for what? Yes for what?

We think one government enough for one people. "No man can serve two masters."—No man can serve the priest and be true to the civil government, at least, to a civil government like ours. The clergy, who have organized the government to which we allude, and which must be termed an ecclesiastical government, have few feelings in common with the spirit of republicanism. Look at the plan of this government. It consists, first, of individual churches, governed by certain individuals, termed elders. These elders with the church which they govern are accountable to the Presbytery, which is composed of ministers and ruling elders from the individual churches. This Presbytery is accountable for its measures to the Synod, which is composed of delegates from the several Presbyteries.—The Synod in its turn to the General Assembly, which is composed, if we mistake not, of delegates from all the Synods in the U. States.

From this rapid sketch it may easily be seen the Presbyterians have a very well organized government.—A government which exerts a more powerful control over the true believer or is deemed more binding by him, than our national and state governments. Ask the conscientious Presbyterian which of the two governments he ought to obey in case they should happen to clash, and he will readily say, the "ecclesiastical," for he is bound to obey God rather than man. Should then this ecclesiastical government have views different from those entertained by our civil government, it may easily be told on which side will be found the adherents, or the members of the ecclesiastical establishment.

Now it should be borne in mind the "General Assembly" is in fact, the supreme government of the Presbyterian Church. From it there is no appeal, and it is difficult to conceive even that the people can overrule its measures, unless they rise en masse and say "we will not hear the clergymen of which it is composed preach." But then the clergy need only threaten the rebels with excommunication and with the fire of hell, to recall them to obedience. This "Assembly" consists of individuals from all parts of the country, they can meet in secret conclave, adopt such measures as they choose. By private circulars they can fix the duty of every clergyman of their denomination, and they will never want for means to excommunicate and destroy any one who has the boldness to disobey or to refuse to support their measures.

If a church rebels that can be excommunicated, so of a Presbytery or of a Synod. When we consider the terrour there is in excommunication from the church of God, to every sincere Presbyterian, we may form some idea of the control this assembly has over the church. We ought also to take into our account the habitual deference to the clergy, reverence for their persons and conviction of their importance, in saving the soul, which inspire the breast of every true believer and faithful member, then we may without much difficulty perceive it no hard matter for this Assembly to bring nearly the whole body of their church into their measures—and when the measures are to aggrandize the church we shall find none to dissent among the whole body.

No one will deny such a government as this, tho' professing obedience to the powers that be, is not dangerous, only when their leaders will adopt no dangerous measures or have power to effect. We may see then on what a brittle thread is suspended our liberty. Give this Church the exquisite kind of leaders and sufficient power, and they may dictate every measure of government, blast the reputation of every political man who refuses to bow to them. We propose to show in our future numbers that the leaders of the church mentioned, have the disposition and are fast acquiring the power, to control our civil government.

Will Br. Reese or Br. Flagler inform us to what place the Genesee Association stands adjourned? We have been once informed, but the notice has been mislaid, and we have forgotten.—EDITOR.

ACCIDENT.—Drowned in the Nine-Mile Creek in Marcellus, Onondaga county, on the twenty-third ult., John Shepherd Jun. aged sixteen. He was a son of Mr. John Shepherd of Marcellus. The funeral was attended on the twenty-fourth: a sermon was delivered by Br. Chase, from Job xiv. 14. "If a man die shall he not live again?" [*Communicated.*]

THE FOLLOWING BOOKS ARE FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Kneeland's Greek and Eng. Testament,
Do. Lectures,
Balfour's 1st and 2d Inquiry,
Do. Essays,
Do. Reply to Sabine,
Do. do. to Allen,
Ballou on Atonement,
Do. notes on Parables,
Light of Truth,
Canfield's Review,
Ancient History of Universalism, by H. Ballou 2d,
History of Universalism, by T. Brown.

Together with a variety of pamphlets published by distinguished Universalists. The above books are chiefly so well known that any recommendation from us would be superfluous. Ancient History of Universalism is a new work, and one which all classes of readers should be anxious to possess.

CONTROVERSY.

We call the attention of our readers to the controversy commenced in to-day's Advocate between Mr. Reese and ourself, as we trust they will peruse it with interest. It is not a quarrel, or any thing which should excite any alarm. Universalism, if we have not grossly misunderstood it, tolerates differences in opinion. At least, Universalists have contended for the right, not only to *think* for ourselves, but to *express* our honest convictions, however different they may be from the convictions of others; and we most sincerely hope, that, having advocated this long enough to become respectable for their numbers and influence, they will not now find it necessary to follow the practice of others and forbid the exercise of this inestimable right.

Were we to ask what has given Universalists their present respectability, we should be compelled to point to the freedom and fearlessness of their enquiries, to the boldness with which they have attacked existing errours, and to the independence they have themselves exhibited, and which they have encouraged in others, as the true secret of our prosperity. We have run well for a time. Having begun in the spirit, are we so foolish as to think of being made perfect in the flesh? For ourself we enlisted under the standard of free enquiry, with a determination to embrace TRUTH wherever found. We shall not desert our standard. If our brethren forsake it we shall regret their example, but we shall not follow it. Our motto is "ONWARD," and no entreaties shall change our resolutions, and no fears of growling bigotry, or pale timidity starting at her shadow, shall induce us to return to the "flesh pots of Egypt"

We value a "free press" as the most powerful engine in the emancipation of the world, but vain to talk of a "free press" when you cannot advance a speculative idea different from what others may embrace, without having the *clergy* threaten you with loss of patronage, brand you with the vilest epithets, and exert all their influence to take from you the bread you need. Ours is and shall be, while we have any thing to do with it, a Free Press. Free in every sense of the word. We will bow to no authority we do not believe just, and give our sanction to no sentiment which to us does not appear beneficial to man while here. Priests may growl, zealots may bark,

"Tray, Blanch, sweet heart, little dogs and all."

But, we shall persevere in the path conscience points, and exert what powers God has given us for the benefit of the human race.

Every day are we more and more impressed with the importance of adhereing to a bold and independent course. The Christian Church is awfully corrupt. Its influence as it exists is most painful to the benevolent mind, and deeply prejudicial to the best interest of society. Under its sanction there is now in the bosom of our own country, a foul conspiracy formed. A machine is constructed, if not "instar montis" at least equally treacherous and destructive as that formed against the ancient walls of Troy. Our country is overrun with pious beggars—political doctrines the most dangerous are not only taught, but obeyed far as they can be; society after society with immense funds are springing up, their plans ripened by a secret correspondence between the most influential of a certain class of divines throughout the Union. A few days the volcano will burst. Are we to be silent? or to acknowledge their power by the timidity and faint-heartedness with which we speak? Let him who would basely betray his country and the rights of man, that he may kiss the great toe of a Pope, do it. But let the hand with which we write be stiff in death before we desert our post or betray such pusillanimity in its defence.

We approve Christianity but we detest that which bears its name among a vast majority of those who are called Christians. We believe a reformation needed, we have thrown in our mite to aid one. We would sooner have no religion than that which the many now embrace. We may indeed be wrong in our views of what is truth. We will therefore listen to whatever others may offer though we must then have the privilege of consulting our own judgement, and abiding its decision.—ED.

Rev. E. BEELS, Pierpont, Astabula county Ohio, is requested to send the publisher returns of his Agency. Some of our subscribers have informed us that they have paid him, and we have received from him neither information or remittance. This request is extended to the Rev. Mr. SINCLAIR, Ohio, who appears also to have received money on account of the Advocate, and has so long neglected to make returns that this notice is considered necessary. Several other Agents will be noticed as soon as the publisher has leisure to examine his accounts.

The present is a momentous crisis. All sects are shaking. The religious world is convulsed. Atheism has opened her batteries. Skepticism is big with hopes. Catholick and Protestant Popery are plodding and plotting for the supremacy. The little and the great Popes are on tiptoe. Saints are praying for the Millennium; myriads are labouring for its introduction. The Bible and the Creeds are at war. There is no truce. Such is the present.—*Christ. Baptist.*

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U.F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, AUGUST 8, 1829. [NO. 16.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

BY THOMAS WHITTEMORE, ON LUKE XVI. 19—31.

PARABLE,

OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

It is a command of our Lord and Saviour that we "*search the Scriptures*," and of the Apostle Paul, that we "*prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*" Therefore, notwithstanding many learned and good men have advocated the doctrine of endless misery, and adduced the text as proof of it, we cannot receive it because they have believed it, nor our text as proof of it, because it has been used as such. We receive no doctrine until we are convinced of its truth by evidence. Whenever our views of Christianity agree with those of our brethren of other denominations, we feel no small degree of pleasure in making it known; but we feel it our imperious duty openly to avow our difference from them, when their views seem to us to disagree with the plainest passages of scripture, and the simplest dictates of reason.

That part of the scriptures which we have selected as our text, is said by many to be, not a parable, but a literal relation of facts. It is easy to see why they contend that this is not a parable. If it is a parable, the proof it is supposed to contain of the doctrine of misery in a future state, is greatly impaired. Those things which Jesus used *as figures* of the reality, have been taken for the reality itself. A parable is not unlike a similitude; it is "a relation under which something else is figured." Our Saviour often spake in parables. "He spake many things unto them in parables." Matt. xiii. 3. So common a thing was it for him to speak in this way, that Matthew has said, "without a parable spake he not unto them," xiii. 34.—The most of you will recollect the beautiful and instructive parable of the sower, which our Saviour himself explained. The sower went forth to sow. "Some seeds fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them up. Some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth; and forthwith they sprung up because they had no deepness of earth; and when the sun was up they were scorched; and because they had no root they withered away. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up and choaked them. But others fell into good ground," &c. Now we do not think that a man actually went and sowed seed in this way. Such an interpretation would destroy the idea of a *parable*. The doctrine which he meant to teach was, that the truth would be received in different ways by different people, and that it would produce different effects. See his explanation of this parable, Matt. xiii. 18—23. We think that the text is a parable. The evidence of this, which we shall lay before you, is to us irresistable. But before we introduce this part of our subject, we will, for a moment, allow the text to be a literal relation of facts; and we will enquire whether, allowing this, it will prove either of the two great doctrines advocated by christians in general. One of these doctrines is believed by Calvinists, viz. that God elected to his favour before the world was created, those who will finally be saved; and that he reprobated to his eternal ire all the rest of mankind. What does the text contain in favour of this doctrine? What do we find in it about election and reprobation? Are we informed that the rich man was reprobated to God's eternal wrath? Or that God hated him? Or that he loved Abraham, or Lazarus more than him? Are we informed that Lazarus was elected to God's peculiar favour? I cannot see one word in the text in favour of the notion, either of election or reprobation. How then does it afford this doctrine any proof? How can it prove that concerning which it does not contain even a reference?

The other doctrine to which I alluded, is, that mankind will be punished and rewarded in the future state for the vices and virtues of this world. What does the text, understanding it literally, contain in favour of this doctrine? We read that the rich man was in torments in *hades;* but not because he had been wicked; and we read that the beggar was happy; but not because he had been good. I see no evidence in the text, that the rich man was a very bad man, or that the beggar was better than he. We are not informed that the former obtained his riches improperly, or that the beggar did not become poor by his own negligence or imprudence. Is it a sin to be rich? Is it a virtue to be poor? It has been alleged against the rich man, that he refused Lazarus the crumbs which fell from his table. If this be a fact, why did Lazarus lay at his gate? We should judge by the account, that some persons, through compassion perhaps the friends of the beggar, carried him

to the rich man's gate and laid him there. Would they have done this, had they known him to be covetous? Of all places the rich man's gate was selected as the most proper for the poor man to lay at. Besides, the word translated *desiring* in the account, is sometimes rendered *delighting*.* And if we read that the beggar *delighted* to be fed with the crumbs, is not this a proof that he was not denied them? How then will the text prove that men will be punished in the future state because they are sinful in this world? I repeat, I see no evidence that the rich man was a bad man. The prayer which he offered to Abraham is a manifestation of a good spirit. How much better could Lazarus or Abraham have prayed, had either been in the rich man's situation? The rich man prayed that his five brethren might be warned, and prevented from coming to that place of torment. Abraham seems at one time to be accounting for the rich man's torment: but he says nothing about any previous wickedness in him. "Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted and thou art tormented." He did not say, remember thou in thy life time wast wicked, but Lazarus good.

Another enquiry properly coming before us is, does not the literal sense of the text pointedly disagree with the notions of those who contend that it is not a *parable*? We often hear that those who go to hell never have one holy feeling; no desire for the company of the blessed; that they spend their time in blaspheming God. Was it so with the rich man? Do we read of his blaspheming God? No; but we read of his offering up a prayer, and a very good one too. "I *pray* thee therefore, father," said he, "that thou wouldst send him (Lazarus) to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto him, lest they also come into this place of torment." Did he not in this language breathe forth a good desire? Did he not have a holy feeling? Abraham, when speaking of the great gulf, said it was fixed "so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." Here two things should be noticed. 1. There were some with Abraham that would go to the rich man; but could not. And, 2. There were some with the rich man who would go to Abraham; but could not. It appears from this, that there were some in hell who had a desire for the company of the blessed, and would have gone to them, had it been in their power. And we learn, furthermore, that hell cannot be so dreadfully hot a place as it has been represented to be. For if this were so, the rich man we should think would have called for more water than Lazarus could have carried on the tip of his finger. And suppose the common idea of a devil be correct, how would he be pleased to have so benevolent a prayer as that of the rich man, offered up in his dark dominions? The *literal* sense of the text disagrees very much with many people's notions of a future world.

Now let us turn to Abraham and those with him. It is commonly supposed that those who are in heaven are serenely happy, and perfectly reconciled to the will of God. We have already shown that there were some in the place of happiness who would go to the rich man; but could not. They were not, therefore, perfectly happy, inasmuch as they were desirous of doing that which they were not permitted to do. Neither were they reconciled to the will of God? for it was the will of God that they should not go, and he had made the great gulf to prevent them. Wishing to do what was not permitted to be done, they were unhappy, and being unreconciled to God, they were wicked. If wicked, they must have been miserable. So we have one argument to prove that those who were with Abraham were wicked, and two that they were miserable. How will these things agree with the opinions of those who contend that the text is a literal relation of facts? Those who were in heaven were unreconciled to God, and those who were in hell were unreconciled to the devil. How can the text be explained *literally* by our opposers, and they maintain also their present notions?

But it may be said, those in heaven were benevolent, sympathetick, and were urged by good motives to endeavour to relieve the distressed. But I ask, how could they be ignorant of God's determination to punish the wicked eternally? And will it be said, they were better than God? Was not he as good, sympathetick and benevolent as they? Let those who interpret the text literally consider these things. Let them tell us why those in heaven wished to go down to

* The word here rendered *desiring* is *epithuman*. Of this word Parkhurst says, that, written with an infinitive following, it signifies "*to be content, or glad, to esteem it a great matter;*" and he adduces the instance in the parable before us, of its occurring in this sense. To which he adds, "thus Elsner on Luke xvi. 21, explains it, and observes not only that the LXX, have so applied it, Isa. lviii. 2, but that Lysias has used it in a like sense, Orat. 24. Dr. Campbell says, "I agree with those who do not think there is any foundation, in this expression, for saying that he was refused the crumbs. When the historian says, that he was laid at the rich man's gate, he means not, surely, that he was once there, but that he was usually so placed, which would not probably have happened, if he had got nothing at all. The other circumstances concur in heightening the probability. Such are, the rich man's immediately knowing him, his asking that he might be made the instrument of the relief wanted; and, let me add this, that though the Patriarch upbraids the rich man with the carelessness and luxury in which he had lived, he says not a word of inhumanity; yet, if we consider Lazarus as having experienced it so recently, it could hardly, on this occasion, have failed to be taken notice of. Can we suppose that Abraham, in the charge he brought against him, would have mentioned only the things of least moment, and omitted those of the greatest?" Note on Luke xvi. 21.

hell. Was it to abide there? Was it to relieve some friend, some relation? Would some parent comfort his child? Some child, its parent? Some brother, a sister? Some husband, a wife? No, answer the orthodox, the saints say Amen, alleluia, when they see the smoke of the wicked's torment ascend. How will those who do not allow that the text is a parable, surmount these difficulties?

Now allowing the text to be a literal relation, what will it prove? It will *not prove the doctrine of election and reprobation; it will not prove that men are to be punished or rewarded in the next life for their conduct in this;* but it will prove that there was a man tormented in *hades*, who was a good man in some respects, and for aught we know, as good as any body else; it will prove that those who are in heaven are both wicked and miserable, that they wish to leave the place and go to hell; and it will prove that some notions which orthodox people have entertained for years, are totally erroneous. Those who contend that it is not a parable, for any thing I see, must allow all these things.

But the hearer will say, that the text, understood literally, proves that men will be punished after death. I answer, if we interpret it literally, and suppose the death of the rich man to mean the departure of life from his animal frame, then it will teach that one man was tormented in another state of being; but whether it should be for one year, one day or hour, we could not tell. One thing is certain, it would not then prove the doctrine of *endless torment*, because the place, *the hell* in which the rich man was tormented *is to be destroyed*, according to the testimony of Hosea, "*O hades, I will be thy destruction*," (Hos. xiii. 14.) and of John, "*And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire*," (Rev. xx. 14.) and of Paul, "*O hades where is thy victory*, (1 Cor. xv. 55.) But if I may have the liberty of interpreting parables literally, I will engage to prove you almost any thing. There is no intelligent christian who does not know that those things which Jesus used as figures of the reality, should not be considered the reality itself.

There is sufficient evidence, both internal and external, to prove that the text is a parable.—We will briefly examine the internal first. It is stated in the text that the beggar was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. Now I ask, can any one suppose that celestial beings actually, really carried a poor beggar and put him into the bosom of the patriarch Abraham? No; you say, this is a representation of heaven.—Now you have interpreted the text as a parable yourselves. And permit me to remark, that I have all the right to interpret the whole text parabolically that you have to interpret any part of it so. You will see that these people are represented as having bodily organs and powers with them. The rich man had eyes and a tongue, and Lazarus fingers. Can this be interpreted literally? Do disembodied spirits in the world to come have eyes, and tongues, and fingers, and the powers of speech, of hearing and of seeing? We do not profess to know much about spirits in another world, but we believe this is not the common opinion upon the subject. However, it belongs to those who say the text is not a parable, to show how this can be, to give some proof upon the subject; and to shew us how people in heaven and hell can converse with apparent ease from one place to the other.

The external evidence that the text is a parable is the connexion in which it is found. We should maintain a proper connexion throughout our Lord's discourse. I see no way to do this, if we do not consider the text to be a parable. It is found connected with a number of parables, in Luke vx. and xvi.

In the beginning of the 15th chapter, we find a murmur which the scribes and Pharisees expressed, because Jesus received sinners and ate with them. In the three parables which fill up the remainder of this chapter, viz. that of the lost sheep, lost pieces of silver, and prodigal son, Jesus vindicated that part of his conduct of which they had complained. But in the last of these three parables, a character was presented which had not appeared in either of the others. This was the elder brother of the prodigal, who was angry because the prodigal was received into favour, and who very justly represented the scribes and Pharisees; for they murmured because Jesus Christ received sinners and ate with them. These Pharisees rejected the gospel; and this is represented by the elder brother's refusing to go into his father's house. In the parable of the unjust steward with which the 16th chapter is commenced, the same people are admonished for not making such improvement of the law, as would introduce them into the christian faith and church. The Pharisees being provoked at this, derided Jesus. After briefly describing to them their conduct, he says, "the law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Jesus then spake another parable, in which the folly of the Jews, in rejecting the gospel and adhering to the law, is represented by the sin of Adultery. Then come the words of the text; "There was a certain rich man," &c. What is there in all this connexion which would have the least tendency to lead the mind to such doctrine as that which the text is used to support?—It has been justly said, "To suppose that he who spake as never man spake, abruptly dropped the subject of the end of the law dispensation, and the introduction of the gospel, or kingdom of heaven, and having no further allusion to this subject, proceeded to give an account of the sin of adultery, which account occupies but one verse, and then again flies directly from this subject, to give a literal

account about a rich man and a beggar, in this world and in an eternal state, is so unwarrantable, and so derogatory to the character of the divine orator, that it is a matter of wonder that such an opinion should ever have been honoured with the consent of learned commentators."—Ballou.

Having shown, as I think, that the text is a parable, I shall now proceed to show you the true meaning of the word *hades;* why our Lord spake of it as a place of torment; and why he used it figuratively, as he undoubtedly did in the text. *Hades* is the word rendered hell.* Its literal meaning is not a place of torment in another world: but the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of persons, their happiness or misery. This was the meaning of the Hebrew word *Sheol*, which the LXX have almost invariably rendered *hades*. *All men* go down to *hades* at death, where they remain till the resurrection. It is said in the scripture that our Saviour's soul was in hell, *hades*. Not in a place of torment; but in the state of the dead, the grave. But it did not remain, for he rose from the dead. See Acts ii. 27. In the Improved Version, the place where the rich man was, is called "the unseen state," and in Wakefield's translation, "the grave." These are their definitions of *hades*. Wakefield says, in his note on this place, "It must be remembered that *hades* no where means hell, *gehenna*, in any authour whatsoever, *sacred* or *profane;* and also that our Lord is giving his hearers *a parable*, (Matt. xiii. 34,) and not a piece of *real history*. To them who regard the narration as exhibiting *a reality*, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the *purgatory* of the *Papists*. The universal meaning of *hades* is *the state of death.*" Whitby, who was farther from being a Universalist than Wakefield, says, Sheol throughout the old testament, and Hades in the Septuagint, answering to it, signify *not the place of punishment*, or of the souls of *bad men only*, but the *grave only*, or the place of death." He says, Hades is the place—"Whither *we are all* going."—Old Jacob went there; Job *desired*, yea prayed to go there; Hezekiah expected to be there, for he said "I shall go to the gates of Hades." Whitby further says, "The ancient Greeks assigned one Hades to all that died, and therefore say, Hades *receives all mortal men together, all men shall go to hades*. Dr. Campbell, a believer of the doctrine of endless misery, gives us the same account of *hades*. This then is what we must understand the word hell to mean, when it stands for *hades*, a place to which all men go, good and bad. We must not, when we contemplate it, look forward beyond the resurrection. All men will be raised from *hades* to incorruption and immortality. *Then hades* will be destroyed. Our word hell, in its original signification, perfectly corresponded to the definition we have given of *Hades*. Now it does not; with christians generally here, its meaning somehow has been changed: but we are informed, I believe by Dr. Doddridge, that the original sense of the word hell is now retained in the eastern, and especially in the western counties of England; where to *hele* over a thing is to cover it. Hence says Dr. Campbell, "it (*hades*) *ought never in the scripture to be rendered hell, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by christians.*" He says that with the meaning of *hades*, "the word hell, in its primitive signification, perfectly corresponded. For, at first, it denoted only what was secret or concealed." The rich man, and the beggar, and Abraham, were all represented as being in *hades* together. We do not read in the text that one was in hell, but the other two in heaven. This differs materially, I know, from the common opinion on this subject; but I see no way to avoid it. The text says not one word to the contrary. Nay, it rather favours the idea.—For otherwise, how could the rich man see Abraham and Lazarus? How could he converse with Abraham, and how could Abraham hear him?

As we have proved by the most respectable, orthodox authority, that the literal and original meaning of *hades* is the same as the Hebrew *sheol*, signifying the state of the dead in general, the place whither we all go, whether good or bad, it remains for me to shew why our Lord spake of it as a place of torment. Let it be then remembered, that when our Lord was upon the earth, the minds of the Jews had changed with regard to *hades*; they entertained different views of it from those they imbibed by reading the old testament. They had deviated from that sense in which the sacred writers had used it; and thought that ghosts of departed men would be punished there. They did not think that all who went there would be unhappy; for they supposed it was divided into different parts, for ghosts of different characters. That they did not learn this idea from the old testament, is sufficiently obvious; for no such idea is there. Dr. Campbell says, "It is plain, that in the old testament, the most profound silence is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys, or sorrows, happiness or misery." They could not have learned it from the new testament; for this was not then written. Where then did they learn it? Answer, From the idolatrous, heathen nations around them. In support of this I shall read you a quotation from the learned authour just

*There are four words rendered hell in the scriptures, viz. *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*, and *Gehenna*.—*Sheol*, being Hebrew, occurs only in the Old Testament. Of the 64 instances in which it is found, in 32 it is rendered hell, and in the remaining 32 pit and grave. Hades occurs 11 times, in 10 of which it is rendered hell, and once (1 Cor. xv. 55) grave. Tartarus occurs but once (2 Peter ii. 4,) Gehenna is found 12 times, and is uniformly rendered hell.

named. He thus writes, Dis. vi. Part 2, Sect. 19. "But the opinions neither of Hebrews nor of heathen, remained invariably the same. And from the time of the captivity, more especially from the time of the subjection of the Jews, first to the Macedonian empire, and afterwards to the Roman; as they had a closer intercourse with pagans, they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments, particularly on those subjects, whereon their law was silent, and wherein by consequence, they considered themselves as at greater freedom. On this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews in our Saviour's time, from those which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets. As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the ghosts of the departed were susceptible both of enjoyment and of suffering, they were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state, for their merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the pagan fables on this subject, nor did they express themselves entirely in the same manner; but the general train of thinking in both came pretty much to coincide. The Greek *Hades* they found well adapted to express the Hebrew *Sheol*. This they came to conceive as including different sorts of habitations for ghosts of different characters." Here we have our question answered. On whose authority did the Jews believe that *Hades* was a place of punishment? Ans. On the authority of the heathen. Dr. Campbell says, "they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments, particularly on those subjects whereon their law was silent, and wherein, by consequence, they thought themselves as at greater freedom. *On this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews in our Saviour's time, from those which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets.*" "The general train of thinking," says he, "in both (i. e. Jews and heathen) came pretty much to coincide." Now I seriously believe that it was to this opinion, that *hades* was divided into different habitations, peopled by good and bad spirits, that our Lord alluded in the text. Hence, both Abraham and the rich man are represented as being in one place, divided into different apartments by the great gulph. The Jews were tenacious of these ideas; and our Lord used them as figures of an important truth.—And the reason why he spake in parables generally, may be rendered why he spake parabolically in the text. He did not allude to their doctrine to recognize it as truth; no, and all the evidence we find in the text of the truth of heathen notions concerning *hades* is, that he used them as a similitude. In the parable of the sower, to which we have before alluded, Jesus used natural things as similitudes of spiritual. We do not understand the figures as realities here, and we should not in the text.* What intelligent person would infer from reading this parable, that a man actually went and sowed seed, some by the way side, some upon stony places, and some among thorns? Have we not proved that the text is a parable?—Have we not shown that literally it proves a doctrine which nobody believes? I ask then, by what just rule of interpretation this can be said to prove the doctrine of a future state of punishment? We have the opinion of the learned that this is a parable; we see nothing to prove it is not; and we then demand, why we should not adopt the same rules in explaining it that we do in explaining other parables? Parables, we all know, are figurative language. The truth taught is to be sought under the figure.

If the text be not a parable, it should be interpreted literally throughout. But this cannot be done, as we think we have shown. We, in this way, must receive the heathen's notion of *hades*; we must consider Abraham and Lazarus in hell, as well as the rich man, and this too with their bodies, with the senses of seeing, hearing, &c. &c. Who is prepared to admit this? Let it be then distinctly understood, that it is our opinion, Jesus used those views of *hades* parabolically, which the Jews had received of the heathen. He did not use them to recognise them as realities, any more than he did the figures and imagery of his other parables.

It has been justly remarked, that if Jesus had meant to teach that *hades* was a place of punishment, he would have stated it plainly once at least. This he did not do. He hints it only, and then in a parable. And we should think if the Apostles had understood him as teaching that *hades* was a place of punishment, they would have preached it as such. This they never did. They spake of *hades*, but not as a place of punishment, or torment. Peter said, that Christ's soul was there; not in a place of torment, but in the state of the dead. These facts weigh so heavily on our minds that we esteem it unnecessary to say more, until some one shall attempt to shew that the text is not a parable; and to invalidate the evidence we have given that it is. When any man feels disposed to contend for *heathen* notions of *hades*, as a doctrine of christianity, we will then meet him in a proper way, and discuss the question concerning the higher origin of Christianity.

We will now endeavor to show what our Saviour meant by the parable. But here we should again consult the connexion. Just before he spake the parable, he said, "the law and the prophets *were until John:* since *that*

*If there are any who think that no parable, in its literal sense, is impossible, and that Jesus would not have used, even in figure, what is untrue in itself, let them consult Judges ix. 8—15.

time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Here notice, that when Jesus spake these words, the law dispensation was ended; for that was "*until John*" only: "*since that time*," says Christ, "the kingdom of God (the gospel dispensation) is preached." "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." By this we learn that the law could not pass away, without being fulfilled. We now come to the parable concerning adultery, which reads as follows: "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery." If the Jews had put away the law, and married another covenant *before John came*, they, in a parabolick sense, would have committed adultery." For infinite wisdom ordained that the law should remain "*until* John." And it ordained that it should remain no longer. For "*since that time* the kingdom of God is preached." The law was put away; it was fulfilled; "Christ is the end of the law;" he came to close the first dispensation, and introduce the gospel. The Jews, by rejecting the gospel, and adhering to the law, committed adultery, as would a man who should marry a woman that had been put away by her husband. The parable upon which we are now discoursing immediately follows. "There was a certain rich man," &c. The same subject is continued through the chapter. In the text, the state of the Jews, after the kingdom of God had been taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof, is beautifully figured in the description of the rich man's circumstances. I feel sensible that in the explanation of parables, too many have indulged themselves in the exercise of a flying fancy. We should interpret scripture by the help of scripture. I trust that without indulging in fancy, we can obtain the meaning of our Saviour in the text.

By the rich man the house of Israel is represented. They are frequently spoken of under the figure of an individual in the scriptures.—God said by Hosea, "When Israel *was a child*, then I loved him, and called *my son* out of Egypt." Hosea xi. 1. "So the Lord alone did lead him, (the house of Israel) and there was no strange God with him. He made him ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields; and he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock." Deut. xxxii. 12, 13.—These are sufficient to show that the posterity of Abraham are spoken of in the scriptures in the character of an individual.

This man was rich. "There was a certain *rich* man." He was blessed with a land flowing with milk and honey. He had advantage every way, chiefly because unto him was committed the oracles of God. In Rom. ix. 4, 5, we have in detail an account of this man's riches. "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises: whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever, Amen."

This man was clothed in "*purple and fine linen*." So Israel is represented in the Scriptures as being clad. "I clothed thee also with broidered work, and shod thee with badger's skin, and I girded thee about with *fine linen*, and I covered thee with silk. Thus wast thou decked with gold and silver, and thy raiment wast of *fine linen*, and silk, and broidered work." Ezek. xvi. 10—13. "And of the blue, and *purple*, and scarlet, they made clothes of service, to do service in the holy place, and made the holy garments for Aaron; as the Lord commanded Moses. And he made the ephod of gold, blue, and *purple*, and scarlet, and *fine* twined *linen*." Exo. xxxix. 1, 2.

He fared sumptuously every day. This was eminently true of Israel. God says, "thou didst eat fine flour, and honey, and oil; and thou wast exceeding beautiful, and thou didst prosper into a kingdom." The rich man's land flowed with milk and honey. He fed spiritually upon the knowledge of God, and upon the promises.

By Lazarus the beggar, the poor Gentiles, excluded from the advantages which God's covenant people enjoyed, are represented. Paul details the poverty of the Gentiles. "*At that time*," *says he*, "*ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.*" They were poor indeed. His being "full of sores," represented the moral condition of the Gentiles. By the death of the beggar is represented the Gentiles' release from their idolatrous worship; and his being carried by angels into Abraham's bosom, represent the conversion of the Gentiles to the faith of Abraham, by the messengers of God. The rich man died politically. He lost his riches, his purple and fine linen, his government, his city, and his existence as a body politick. He was buried. His going into outer darkness is justly represented by being buried He died to light, and went into darkness. The poor man died to darkness and came forth to light.—Hence he is not said to be buried. The rich man sees Lazarus in Abraham's bosom; he sees fulfilled the words of Christ, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God."

The rich man calls upon Abraham, whom he

addresses by the title of Father. This is characteristick of the Jews. Abraham was their father; and they seemed proud of their progenitor. Speaking to our Saviour, they said, "art thou greater than our father Abraham?" John told them, "think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father." Yes, they would be in favour with Abraham. They have disbelieved Jesus; they have abused their privileges; they have relied upon their national greatness, and the glory of their ancestors. When in distress they turned to Abraham for mercy. But their national greatness is gone, and the glory of their ancestors can afford them no relief. Abraham is represented as recognizing the relationship. He refers the rich man to his former condition, as well as to that of the beggar, and seems to give this as a reason why the former was tormented and the latter blessed. This is according to the equality of God's ways. The Jews had possessed a knowledge of God, and been blessed for a long time, while the Gentiles had been without hope, and without God in the world. Now the scene is reversed according to the appointment of God. "It was necessary," said the apostle to them, "that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation unto the ends of the earth."

The gulf which separated the rich man from Lazarus, very well represents any circumstance by which the Jews are separated from the Gentile nations. That such a separation has long existed, admits not of a doubt; and when we reflect that, although many centuries have passed away since the Jews forfeited their national character, they have never become mixed and lost among other nations, we can but recognize some manifest design of Providence in the event. By this gulf we may also understand that purpose of God, in which it is determined by infinite wisdom, that the Jews shall not believe the Gospel until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. This was the subject of prophecy.—Isaiah says, "who hath believed our report?" And John applies this to the unbelief of the Jews in the Messiahship of Jesus. John says "therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, and understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." John xii. 38, 40. Matt. xiii, 14, 15. Mark iv. 11, 12. Luke viii. 10. Acts xxviii. 26, 28. Rom. xi. 8. The divine purpose in this, is consistent with God's impartial character. This blindness of the Jews is to bring about the conversion of the Gentiles, through whose mercy the Jews will at last obtain mercy. Paul, addressing one of the Gentile churches, says, "for as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief; even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy." Rom. xi. 30—31. Of the unbelief of the Jews the prophets had prophesied. When the Gentiles saw the prophesies fulfilled in the obstinacy of the Jews, they were convinced of the divine origin of christianity; they pressed into the kingdom of God. By the mercy of the Gentiles the Jews are at last to obtain mercy. Paul says, "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, (lest ye be wise in your own conceits,) that blindness in part is happened to Israel, *until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.* And SO ALL ISRAEL SHALL BE SAVED; as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." Rom. xi. 25, 26. Although the Jews are now shut out of the kingdom, we can easily perceive they are finally to be brought in. Jesus said unto them, "ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." When they will say this, we are not yet permitted to know; but no one who believes the divine testimony, can doubt that they will at a proper time. The benefit derived from the gulf, will then be obtained, and Jews and Gentiles will rejoice together in the fruition of eternal life.

I have now given you my views of the text, with the evidence which induced me to adopt them. Judge for yourselves my hearers. Let not popularity nor proscription influence you. Be not terrified by the threatening of endless woe. You can form the best Judgment while you are dispassionate and calm. Treat your religious opposers with tenderness and love, yet maintain the independence and faithfulness of Christians.

The way in which we have explained the text, appears consistent with the character of God as the Father and friend of mankind; and it leads us clear of those difficulties with which those meet, who use the text to prove the unmerciful doctrine of eternal and infinite misery. But notwithstanding the explanation I have given accords with the very best feelings of your hearts, I would caution you not to receive it, if you are not convinced of its truth by the force of evidence. Rest your faith on the Bible only. Examine this with freedom and care; and God will bless your exertions to the promotion of your spiritual welfare.

It is said that collections have been taken in several of the Presbyterian Churches in the State of N. York, to support the *Pioneer* line of Stages, which has run the proprietors deeply in debt; and as a recompense, the drivers, and the passengers, when there are any, will throw tracts at persons whom they pass in the road.—[*Trumpet.*

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

LET US BE VIGILENT.

The following extract from a letter of an esteemed correspondent in Chardon, Ohio, will be read with interest, and its suggestions are important.

"An active aid-de-camp of the famous, or rather infamous Josiah Bissell, Jr. has lately returned from the east and announced the intention of our Spiritto-Politico guardians, to make another stop-stage attack on Congress, under some modification not yet developed—so we shall not yet have leave to swallow down our spittle. As far as I can judge the orthodox leaders are now directing the fire of all their batteries at Mr. Campbell and the Universalists, and either hope for an amalgamation of the rest, or to beat their opponents in detail. I should not fear them at all if I did not discover a spirit of disunion among the liberals; a sectarian spirit which spends its strength in fighting windmills and splitting straws, while their enemies are chuckling at their folly. If Universalists, Campbellites and Unitarians cannot quietly advance side by side in the great work, with all other liberalists (surely we have need of all their strength) but must have intestine broils and bickerings about nice matters of belief, on which we all have a right to differ in opinion, then that mountain of human miseries called orthodoxy, stands firm, and will stand until her enemies, having grown wise by sad experience shall be willing to demolish her, without being too zealous to erect others in different shapes on the ruins. I am persuaded that orthodoxy whose watchful eyes never sleep when her interest is in question, calculates largely and justly too upon the folly of our disjointed and desultory efforts, while at the same time the unity of her own measures is maintained and her vigilence doubled. She has men under pay in this country whose sole business has been for a long time past to get up Sunday schools in every town where it can by any means be effected; and very lately a wagon load of Sunday school books, and those very valuable and edifying things called *tracts* was brought from head quarters at New-York, and distributed without bounds or modesty.—By the by, do you know that those famous tracts were stolen from the writings of Hannah More, and have been so varied as to form in the Presbyterian line instead of the Episcopalian? But no matter, the end sanctifies the means."

REMARKS.

We are unwilling to dismiss this subject without farther remark. We have long witnessed with pain the differences and the contentions of those who ought to be among the liberals of the day. The times require Union. The imposing aspect and the threatening measures of those who claim to themselves all that is correct in theory or virtuous in practice, call aloud upon all the friends of liberty to heal their dissensions, to give up their intestine broils, and array themselves to meet the dangers with which all alike will be overwhelmed if they are not averted.

Orthodoxy is making a desperate effort, if she fails now she is gone forever, but if she succeeds woe to them who have become objects of her vengeance.—But succeed she will, if we continue to anathematize each other and to refuse to receive the aid of any that cannot say shibboleth to every tenet in our creed. The truth is Sectarism has spread beyond the bounds of the creed, which can allow it. This must be checked. Unitarians and Universalists are by the position they hold placed among the liberals. Let them cease their contentions. What if the Unitarian will not *say* he believes all will be saved? If he allows free enquiry and defends the freedom of discussion why not be satisfied. And what if the Universalist believes God will make no one eternally miserable, if he will allow others to believe so if they choose, why should there be contention?

The Friend, the Anti-Sectarian of the Christian Baptist, the Sceptick, the Materialist, and the Jew, all are interested to defend the rights of conscience and all should unite to destroy priestcraft, to perpetuate our free institutions, and to give and preserve to every one all the rights which nature and nature's God has allotted him. On these broad principles we may all unite, and on these we *must* unite unless we mean to become the vassals of a dominant clergy.

Let every Press which is not under the control of the clergy (alas! there are few such) speak. Let publick sentiment speak, we do not mean that sickly wretch which courts only popularity and is contented with the homage of falsehood and hypocrisy, but that sentiment which every freeman, which every patriot, every republican, and every philanthropist approves, and then we can keep off this ever to be deprecated hierarchy, otherwise we cannot. The remaining veterans who achieved our political, must now come forward to defend our mental independence. Or rather let their children equal their fame. As they gave us civil liberty in a charter and declared what were our rights, let us enter upon the enjoyment of them.

This is an eventful period. Orthodoxy will fight hard in her death struggle, and nothing but boldness, and perseverance, joined with calmness and prudence, can achieve for oppressed humanity the victory. Let us away with our wordy disputes. Away with our distinctions of cast. We must save our strength for our campaign against the enemies of liberty, or rather we should now exert it, for the campaign has opened and the war is fairly commenced. The orthodox last year made an attack upon the interest of individuals—last winter they made an attack upon Congress, but were repulsed. They are now collecting their forces and preparing for another. It will soon be made & it is well if we are able to sustain the violence of the shock. Alas for Ohio and the great valley of the Mississippi. An army of our eastern bigots will march there soon, they are preparing their tracts, collecting their funds,

and even now we fancy the attack is made. Friends of the West be vigilant, resist the invader, with that independent spirit you have always shown.—EDITOR.

CHURCH AND STATE.—NO. 3.

In our last we gave a promise, that, in our future numbers, we would show, the leaders of the orthodox party, have the disposition, and are fast acquiring the power, to control our civil government. We are duly sensible of the high character the clergy sustain; we know full well the measure of their revenge, upon the audacious spirits who presume to question the sincerity of their professions, and we would not prefer the charge, we have, without sufficient evidence to support it. We are hostile to no one. We should despise ourself if we could descend to the meanness of fixing the odium of the measure upon any class, for the sinister purpose of gaining credit for our particular tenets. We have foresworn the spirit of sectarism, and we despise it as much, and would oppose it as quick, in a Universalist as in a Calvinist. This we think may easily be supported from the course we have pursued and from the liberal censures we have received from many who possess the name, though not the spirit of Universalism.

We respect no man merely for his profession, or indeed if any, it should be the hitherto humble, but always important, professions of the agriculturalist, and of the mechanick. On the pursuits of these, depend the very existence of society; and if we must have a privileged class, these shall have our vote to be its members.—The clergy have indeed long made one of the privileged class, but it has long been the misfortune of the world to value things in an inverse ratio to their real worth. A clergyman should be respected as a man, but not as a clergyman, and he should be valued according to his real utility to the world. To us it is a matter of indifference, how the world be benefitted, if the benefit be actually conferred, whether it be in preaching, in singing or in praying. The clergy have an interest in common with the rest of mankind. When they do not imagine they have a *separate* interest, we shall never be found opposing them, when they do, we shall deem it our duty to admonish them and bid the people "beware!"

If we turn to the history of the clergy, and learn what has been their character in times past, we may also learn that to *suspect* the clergy as ambitious of obtaining an undue proportion of power, is no crime, and to find it really so, would not contradict their established character.

With the history of the priesthood we have made ourself somewhat familiar. This indeed was our duty, since the world will have it, we are a priest ourself, though we think not a very worthy member of the ancient and honourable fraternity. But our familiarity with their history has not increased our respect for the institution nor for its members; and certainly we have seen no cogent reason why we should wish to be under the immediate control of the clergy. We pass over the many gross impositions they have palmed upon us, the pious frauds they have committed and the thousand silly stories they have made us believe.—The people, in these respects, have little reason to blame any but themselves—they should never have resigned their own understandings.

If we may credit any thing in history we may pronounce the *accumulation of* POWER, the leading object of the clergy in all ages and in all countries of the world. We will not pretend to say the accumulation of power has been always for the purpose of their own aggrandizement, we should hope to find the majority actuated by nobler motives, but whether so or not, they have always converted the power when acquired, to exalt the dignity and to secure the independence of their own order.—They may have deemed that they needed power to be useful, and that the greater their influence, the more beneficial they might be to the world. This indeed might be true and might have been a laudable ambition, had they always been infallible and not subject to the same imperfections as the rest of mankind.—But if one is killed, we do not know that it helps the matter to have lost his life from a benevolent or from a murderous intention in the one who killed him. Though this consideration may lessen the guilt it does not remove the injury; and though we may not *blame* the clergy, we have suffered and it is little matter of importance to the sufferers, to be told it was done by persons desiring to benefit them, or by those wishing only to benefit themselves.

There can be no doubt many of the clerical profession have been honest men, but even the honest have not been much less injurious than the dishonest. They have given a sanctity to the institution, which has preserved it and thus prevented the abolition of the order and with it its numerous train of evils. But honest or dishonest, benevolent or malevolent, they always seem anxious to have their hand in every thing which is doing, they have claimed the honour of every important discovery, of the introduction of every useful measure; and when they were unable to support the claim, or when it was notorious the measure or discovery was independent of them, they have branded it impious and persecuted the authour. We might mention a Galileo, a Tycho Brahe and a host of others who have spread a halo of glory around the human race—men to whose bold and persevering efforts, the present philosopher is so deeply indebted, but they felt the weight of clerical wrath and Galileo was incarcerated for teaching, and obliged to recant, to renounce as false, a doctrine which every school boy is now instructed to believe true.

We said the priesthood have always aimed at the accumulation of power. They have ; and they have never given sleep to their eyes nor slumber to their eye-lids, when they had it not or until they had set some machine to work to procure it. Masters of the human heart, they have laughed when the people talked of liberty, and when the people by positive laws abolished their powers they recovered it by enforcing the law of superstition. An empire has never been enslaved but the priests have upheld the masters—produced for the tyrants aid, sacred texts and pious expositions. They have contributed their share in fomenting most wars whether foreign or civil. They seldom refuse their prayers or deny the benefit of their holy rites to the king or to the officer who hearkens to their lessons, nor have they ever been sparing in their anathemas to the one who contemns God by refusing to consult them.

They preach the divine right of kings, advocate legitimacy and maintain the inviolability of the throne, whenever they can thus secure a splendid establishment for themselves ; and they proclaim the sovereignty of the people and justify innovation when they have any thing to hope for themselves by a change. They cry down education, or seem to encourage it, just as it is deemed necessary to maintain, or to increase their influence over the human mind. Their policy has always been the same, though the measures adopted vary as circumstances require. In an age of ignorance and wonder, they performed miracles, maintained their power by confounding the reason and rendering the judgement useless. When the people became too enlightened to pay implicit confidence to all their marvellous works and marvellous stories, they anathematized knowledge and extolled ignorance as the mother of devotion.—They stamped a celestial curse upon the exercise of the mental powers and offered heaven to those who would believe without reason.

When the keys of knowledge were finally wrested from them by the hands of the profane laity, when science began to blaze forth in powerful contrast to the rays of darkness shed by them, and when they could no longer lull the active mind asleep, they became learned, seemed to advocate knowledge. They placed themselves at the head of all the seminaries of learning, became tutors in the families of the opulent, and penetrating into courts they became the instructors of kings and princes.—Thus they managed to control what they could not prevent nor destroy, and to turn into the channel of their own ambition the stream which might have watered the whole earth.

Nor did they encourage knowledge though they fostered education. They called the mind from the contemplation of nature, from acquiring a knowledge of things, to ponder over their venerated lore : and they wasted on the obscurity of a long since fulfilled prediction, or in acquiring a dead language of dead people who left in their history neither greatness to imitate nor wisdom to admire, the time and the powers which under more favourable circumstances, would have made us acquainted with the means of improving our condition of relishing the beauties of nature and of adoring the beneficent Father of all. They taught words without ideas, made their pupils learned without knowledge and substituted praise for science in the room of science itself, and self-conceit in the place of love of true wisdom.

Wherever the priesthood has been predominant the people have been enslaven ; the mind has been deprived of its vigour, bound in the shackles of a senseless superstition, it has been incapable of exertion. Vice has been encouraged. Donations to the church for the benefit of the clergy, has supplied the place of virtue, and atoned for a life of crime. Zeal in defending the absurdities and immoralities of the predominant religion, has been deemed sufficient to open the gates of heaven and give a claim to the joys of the blest. Proffering peace they have given us the sword, professing to beat the sword into the plough-share and the spear into the pruning hook, they have converted the implements of husbandry into the instruments of war ; promising a heaven hereafter they have given us a hell on earth ; and claiming to be the ambassadors of God and the messengers of love, they have stirred up the demon discord, alienated the affections of kindred, invaded the sacred apartments of domestick life, destroyed conjugal, filial and fraternal affection ; trampled upon the rights of conscience and cursed, in the name of God, all who have not pronounced them a blessing to the human race and given them tythes of all they possess.

Arrogant in their pretensions, claiming exemption from the common frailties of humanity, and familiar intercourse with the invisible God, they have demanded implicit obedience and heaped the whole mountain of their vengeance upon the inquisitive spirit who presumed to enquire the warrant of their authority or the propriety of their conduct. Long as they could, they smothered the desire for knowledge and that Christendom is now enlightened they say is owing to them ; though the most careless reader of history must know they persecuted with a relentless spirit the philosophers and reformers to whom we are indebted for modern improvements. Such has been the character of the clergy and such the evils they have heaped upon the human family—such their general features, wherever found or whatever name they bear, Pagans, Jews or Christians, Mussulmans or Brahmans, followers of Zoroaster or worshippers of the Lama, and if there be any difference if one class be worse than another, the palm of the greatest *evil is fairly due the Christian.*

Such is their character. We are at loss to

reconcile the discrepencies we find between their professions and their practice. With the best profession on earth or to be found even in heaven, their practice has even disgraced his majesty of hell by being charged to him. Had they come to us as men and acknowledged themselves of like passions with the rest of us, having the same imperfections and liable to the same errours, we could have passed over their inconsistencies, by supposing they had mistaken the best means to make the world virtuous; but when they come as chosen servants of God we are confounded. To call them honest but ignorant, would be to accuse Jehovah of having made an unwise choice, and to pronounce them knowing but dishonest, seems not much better, and yet we know of no other alternative.

Such having uniformly been the character of the clergy, such having been their constant aim and practice, and such the abuses they have tolerated, that we ask, did we wrong to suspect? Did we wrong to bid our readers watch! But we have more than suspicion, we have more than *cause* for suspicion, we have evidence to our mind clear and satisfactory. The orthodox clergy have engaged in a vast enterprize: a mighty project is conceived and all the energies of the order are in requisition to bring it forth. Whatever it may turn out to be, we have seen enough to convince us, it was unholy in its conception, and if executed will be ungodly in its influence.

Our readers will perceive this portrait is designed to show what power the clergy have heretofore aimed at, and the evils they have inflicted. They will from this view, admit it is *possible* for the clergy now to aim at similar power, & if they obtain it, what surety have we that they will not bring similar evils in their train? We have not yet dismissed this subject. Facts are to be laid before our readers, and facts which will make them enquire, "where is the spirit which achieved our Independence?" shall be laid before them.—EDITOR.

MISS FRANCES WRIGHT.

We copy on another page an article from the Free Enquirer, First, because we would have our readers understand that we are not afraid to copy from a paper which many think it would be a crime even to name without reproach.—Secondly, because the article in question is really meritorious and deserves to be read by every one who does not choose to be a bigot.—Thirdly, because it states in a clear and impressive manner, sentiments which we have ever laboured to defend, and Lastly because it gives us a chance to speak a word of its writer Miss Frances Wright.

We have marked with pain the many gross slanders circulated against this distinguished lady. Distinguished, aye indeed, pre-eminently so from the coarse and disgusting reproaches which the professed friends of religion and virtue have cast upon her. We say we have marked this with pain, and we would gladly rescue religion and virtue from the contempt which, the violent measures they have sanctioned, must excite in every discerning mind. We claim no jurisdiction over her sentiments, she has the same right to advocate her views that we have ours. But we would not rest here. We are bound as the conductors of a publick journal to disapprobate every encroachment upon that right, to protect her in its enjoyment.

We know this paragraph may make us a hundred enemies, but we cannot help that. If we vilify her for her sentiments we may just as well vilify the most devout christian for advocating his. The right in question, is one in which all are concerned, and if denied to the heretick it may with the same propriety be denied to the orthodox. We hold him traitor to the principles of our republican government, who would cast the least reproach upon any for advocating the views they believe correct.

The Press, the guardian of liberty, and of virtue, has teemed with abuse, too coarse to be repeated and have given currency to slanders, the most painful to woman's feelings. Why is this so? If she is wrong can no one disprove her arguments? If her sentiments are pernicious can no one show it without relating slanders, which would disgrace the lowest bred gossip to repeat? How is this? Where is the Press that has met her notions with any thing like argument? With us ridicule and libels will not pass for tests of truth. We speak not only our own, but the language of thousands when we say we should be much better pleased to see her errours pointed out, than her person abused, and we are ashamed for the cause of religion, if we have on our side none, who would not only prefer such a course, but are able and willing to come forward to pursue it.

We are ashamed of our countrymen that they should exhibit such enmity towards a woman who, whatever may be the correctness of her conclusions, has given no mean proofs of an enlightened mind and a truly philanthropick heart. And we regret to see the female part of community so severe upon one who adorns their sex and seems anxious to give woman her proper rank in society, the high rank she ought to fill. Miss Wright may err, and who may not? But, abating her views on matrimony which probably are more censured than understood, and censured by more than believe them ill founded, we have seen nothing in her *ethicks* that should be discarded. System she disclaims, but the morality she encourages is based on the equality of the human race and on Universal charity. Infidel she may be, but she has under trials which few of our ladies would endure exhibited an example of forbearance, that many a high toned Christian would do well to follow. When assaulted in a manner that

must awaken all of woman's resentment she has asked no other shield than the mantle of her own conscious virtue. We disbelieve her sentiments on some points, but the greatest fault that we have discovered is she believes not enough, and pleads ignorance where she has no knowledge. Disprove her arguments those who believe her wrong, but be just to her merit. ED.

The proceedings of the publick meeting in Berks Co. Pa. which will be found in this number of our paper, will be read with interest. We wish we were permitted to record the proceedings of similar meetings held in every part of the country. This meeting was in the midst of the German population of Pennsylvania, which population, to the amount of about 300,000, is awakened to a sense of the dangers with which we are threatened. We think it would be well to have a publick meeting of a similar kind in this county, and we wish similar ones could be held in all the neighbouring counties, and indeed throughout the Union. There is need. The danger is great and threatening. Friends think on these things.

SELECTIONS.

[From the Free Enquirer.]

OF RELIGION AND IRRELIGION,

AS DISTINCT FROM KNOWLEDGE AND MORALITY.

Our correspondent has touched upon a subject of most grievous importance to the human species. For the evil of which he complains is unfortunately, not confined to one nation, nor even to one age, but has existed, and still exists, wherever religion has had *a temple*, and its temple *a priest*.

I have frequently attempted to point out, in my writings, as in my publick discourses, that it is only inasmuch as religion is made a trade, and the teaching of it a profession, that it is converted into a source of mischief and cause of quarrelling and persecution. However fantastick the dreams of our ignorance or of our errour, if we never exalted them into a science and made them the subject matter of instruction, they could do but little harm to ourselves, and no harm to our neighbours. In the day that the first temple was built, and the first priest ordained to live by sweeping its courts, and protecting its superstitions, Pandora's box of sins and plagues was opened upon earth, and, if so be, that according to the old fable, hope remains at the bottom, it can only be to whisper the prophecy that men will at length grow wise by experience, and put an end to all *temple worship*, and all *doctrinal preaching*.

So long as the human mind shall be tortured from the cradle to suck in opinions, man must be the most foolish and the most unhappy of all sentient creatures. And so long as any body of men, or any one individual, shall obtain a livelihood by the inculcation of any speculative system whatsoever, let it be orthodox or heterodox, religious or irreligious, must seeds of errour and intolerance be planted in the human mind. The occurrences of every passing day press, more and more, upon the reflecting mind, the necessity of an entire change in our existing method of instruction, whether as employed in schools, in churches, or in books.

Facts, as the sure basis of all correct opinions, must be presented, living, breathing, and moving, as far as possible, to the perceptions of childhood, and all lessons apart from these, must be wholly withdrawn. At present, the human animal only ceases to play the part of the parrot, to act that of the vulture. Having learned to mimick the sounds, and echo the sentiments, of his nurse, his schoolmaster, and his spiritual teachers, he then proceeds to tear and worry all those of his fellow creatures, whose nurse, master and priest have taught them a different lesson—the difference, for the most part, amounting only to a few new tricks upon the same tune.

But, let the tune be different as it may—let the opinions imbibed be even reasonable, or, more, correct—still, in that they have been *learned* instead of *formed*—in that they are taken upon trust—received, ready made, from the factory of other men's brains, instead of formed in our own upon the evidence of fact and experience, they are of small account, and rest upon no more solid foundation, than a house raised upon a quicksand.

To perceive what is true, not to distinguish what is false, must be our object, before we can be rational or virtuous. We may see the absurdities of the Mahometan Bible, or the Christian Bible, and yet be as far from practical truth, as he who worships either, or both. Our opinions on speculative matters (and all is speculative beyond what our senses can distinguish) can never supply the place of knowledge, any more than our religious faith, or our atheism, can ever dictate sound morality.

My experience, which, in the position circumstances have combined to place me, may, perhaps, count for something in the question—my experience bears ample testimony to the truth of the above position, viz: that our opinions on matters merely speculative, can do but little towards our advancement in the path of truth. If, as an individual, while advocating the cause of instructional and conditional equality, proclaiming the simplicity of knowledge, and its universal importance to man, I have had to turn a deaf ear to slander, and a patient cheek to violence—if, as a woman, I have been tracked from house to house by the emissaries of alarmed craftsmen, or envious and mistaken individuals; if fire and riot have been attempted in publick, threats in private, and libellous slanders every where, I can truly say, that I have found the spirit of erring violence equally with the believer as the atheist, with the anti-Christian as with the Christian.

Wealth has been hostile, not because I assaulted superstition, but because I leaned towards the poor; the professions, because I advocated productive industry; the learned, because I revealed the simplicity of real knowledge; the partizans of all opinions, because I deprecated wordy disputation, and taught that truth can be found only by observation, and error disproved by an appeal to nature and to experience.

As a friend to man, and as an enquirer after truth, I owe much to the experience of the last six months. We are all too apt to over estimate the importance of our own speculative views. Wherever we find more or less sympathy, with respect to these, we are disposed to imagine there must be more or less of truth in the practical views also; and to conceit, in proportion as we ourselves incline to religion or to scepticism, that the religious or the sceptical are honest and upright.

I think I shall not again lightly fall into the error. I think that, henceforward, while I shall judge no man's moral excellence by the length of his creed, so neither shall I preconceive him to be virtuous or enlightened in proportion to the shortness of the same.

To be really enlightened, we must understand the phenomena of nature. To be really virtuous, we must know ourselves; accurately distinguish all the relations in which we stand to our fellow creatures; duly estimate our own importance in society, and neither lose sight of our own inherent rights, nor the rights of others.

Virtue, then, does not consist either in believing or in disbelieving the religions of mankind. We may subscribe to the existence of every god and every devil painted by priests, or imagined by enthusiasts; and we may make our belief in such existences only a mean for tormenting ourselves, and a pretext for tormenting our brethren. Or, on the other hand, we may assert the nonexistence of all sentient matter beyond the confines of our planet, and be as intolerant in our feelings towards those who question our position, as was ever a Christian to a Turk, or a Jew to a pagan. And, in either case, however obstinate in our speculative credulity or incredulity, we may be equally ignorant of all practical truth, and, consequently equally useless or mischievous both as men and as citizens.

To doubt what is not seen, is not to know what can be seen. Neither is a knowledge of all external nature sufficient, *without a knowledge of ourselves*, to lead us to that just practice which *an accurate acquaintance with the world without, and the world within*, can alone dictate.

It is in this extensive sense that I have employed the word KNOWLEDGE in the motto of this paper. It is in this sense that I understand JUST OPINIONS TO BE THE RESULT OF JUST KNOWLEDGE, AND JUST PRACTICE OF JUST OPINIONS.

Knowledge, then, not *in part*, but *in fulness*, must be the subject of instruction. Here is the seed from which opinions, to be correct and durable, must rise spontaneously. Let practical philosophers, then, take the place of priests and theoretical disputants, and national asylums and seminaries, for all the congregated youth of the land, supercede churches, bridewells, and jails. F. W.

MEETING OF FREEMEN.

In Heidelberg Township, Berks County.

At a numerous and respectable meeting of citizens assembled at the house of George Gerhand, on Thursday the 21st day of May, 1829, pursuant to a publick notice given by the committee of correspondence, appointed by a meeting in Cacolico township, Lancaster county, on the 19th March last, to deliberate and consult upon the causes and tendency of the religious excitement at present prevailing in the country—Joseph Hain, Esq. was appointed President; Henry Bennetch and John Gerhand, V. Presidents, and John Sohl, Jr. Daniel Wenrick, Secretaries. John Shitz, Jacob Seitzingar, H. Shoner, Martin Texter and J. Hain (of Adam) being appointed a committee to report proceedings for the consideration of the meeting; after retiring for a short time, reported the following address and resolutions which were unanimously adopted.

The committee appointed to report proceedings for the consideration of the meeting, respectfully submit the following:

That a religious excitement exists in many sections of the country, not calculated as they apprehend to promote genuine and rational Piety, and tending to eventually, if not arrested in its progress, to abridge the civil and religious liberties of the people. The cause of this excitement may be found in the extraordinary conduct of certain ecclesiastical Professors, who appear to have undertaken a crusade, for spreading particular religious opinions and the advancement of church establishments. Pervading the country in every direction, they alarm the weak minded and youthful part of our community with unusual vehement denunciations of divine wrath, and thus obtain an influence over minds which is not the result of rational conviction and which is destined to be directed to the elevation of the clerical profession to a degree of authority, inconsistent with the people's welfare and the spirit of the free constitutions under which we live.

It appears to your committee that the Clergy of the United States in general, have exhibited many manifestations of a spirit of worldly ambition. That measures have been projected by that class of men, calculated and designed to promote their own interests at the expense of those of the people; to enable them

to dictate to the consciences of their fellow men, and assume a right of interference in the direction of state affairs. They have observed with dissatisfaction and alarm, the establishment of opulent and influential societies, the management of which is committed to ecclesiastical control. Amongst these they number Bible and Missionary Societies—Theological Seminaries and Sunday School Unions. They regard these institutions as necessary burdens upon the church-going part of the community, appropriating vast sums of money to purposes for the most part uncalled for, & tending directly to increase the influence of the Clergy. They have witnessed the attempts recently made to the Congress of the United States to prohibit the transportation of the mail on Sunday, and regard them as ebullitions of the fanatical spirit, so widely disseminated by the Clergy. They consider all endeavours to procure legislative interference in matters of religion, as attempts to infringe upon the rights of conscience, and all measures adopted to compel particular observance of the Sabbath as incipient approaches to the establishment of spiritual tyranny. Your committee would shrink from proposing a single objection to the Christian Religion. They believe the revealed Religion of the old and new testaments to be the most inestimable gift of a beneficent Creator to the human family. They regard it as a written law, for the guidance of human conduct, exhibiting a sublime and perfect system of morals, and holding forth incentives to the pursuit of virtue in those immortal rewards which Divinity alone could offer. But in revolving the histories of by gone ages they are admonished by the wails of nations and the groans of oppressed people, to beware of a body of men assuming to be the interpreters of the Divine word and the directors of men's consciences. They contemplate wtth horrour, the intolerance and bloody persecutions of the church of Rome, and the debased condition of the people in every nation, where ecclesiastical rulers bear the sway. They look upon England, the most free of European governments, and behind a Union of Church and State, which has burthened the people for ages with an oppressive hierarchy that maintains a luxurious Clergy with the hard won earnings of the Agriculturalists and Mechanick. —They look forward with prophetick apprehensions to the terminating of the race, which fanaticism is running in our own country, and behold in anticipation, misery and slavery, and ecclesiastical tyranny beyond the goal.

Your committee with a view to counteract the efforts which are making to promote ecclesiastical supremacy, respectfully submit the following resolutions for the consideration of the meeting:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, the institution of Bible and Missionary societies, Theological Seminaries and Sunday School Unions are works of supererogation, considered in reference to the wants and welfare of the people; that they are designed to elevate and sustain the authority of the Priesthood, and so considered, are dangerous to the liberties of the people, and that we will not assist in maintaining Clergymen who advocate them or are concerned in their support.

Resolved, That we consider the extraordinary zeal for religion, which manifests itself in the condemnation of innocent amusement and the requisition of an ascetick severity of life, as originating in the false pretences of designing men, or the erroneous opinions of overheated enthusiasm, believing as we do, that a hilarity in enjoying the bounties of Providence, is not unacceptable in the sight of the Almighty dispenser of all things.

Resolved, That our religious and moral duties are plainly set forth in the language of the Holy scriptures; that they consist in *visiting the sick, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, rendering due honour to parents and the exercise of charity towards all men*, and that no amount of mortification or prayer can justify the omission of any of them.

Resolved, That we duly appreciate the advantages of the Sabbath, considered as a day of worship and temporal repose; but that we cannot regard innocent recreations on that day not prohibited by the laws of the land, infractions of its duties or those of rational Piety.

Resolved, That hereafter we will receive no preacher into our congregations who is an adherent or supporter of a theological Seminary, of the Sunday School Union, or the Bible Missionary Tract, or any other similar Societies, or who is engaged in distributing any so called Religious Paper or Magazines, because we sincerely believe those institutions have been introduced for no other purpose than to collect large sums of money, which is to be applied towards erecting an undue influence and power of the Clergy over the people, and consequently may eventually lead to the destruction of our civil and religious liberties.

Resolved, That it is our sincere opinion that all those persons who so conspiciously disseminate principles so dangerous in their consequences, are either hypocrites, seeking their own aggrandizement, or deluded fanaticks, whose blindness seeks to involve millions of free and happy people within the fangs of an over-reaching and ambitious priesthood. That our Saviour came into the world to make men free and happy, is an undeniable truth; but that priest-craft under the garb of religion, endeavours to enslave the world, is also a fact seriously to be deplored.

Resolved, That we view those arrogant and haughty beggars, who in imported broad clothes, strut about our country, distributing tracts and asking money for missionary purposes, as a set

of imposters, too lazy to earn by the sweat of their brow, the food that sustains them.

Resolved, That we are as we have been, ever ready to reward upright and unassuming ministers for their services, and to render their stay among us as agreeable as circumstances will allow with this proviso, however, that they remain free and independent from all connection with those societies, whose ostensible object may seem laudable, but whose real intentions are the promotion of themselves and the slavery of the people. Should however no such preacher be found we will nevertheless, frequent the house of God, and appoint one of the number present to read an appropriate sermon, a chapter from Holy writ, and conclude by a prayer and hymn of thankfulness to the supreme Creator for his mercies.

Resolved, That we approve of the proceedings of a meeting, held March 19th. last past in Cacolico township, Lancaster county, and that we will endeavour our utmost to aid in fulfilling them.

Resolved, That the following named persons be a committee of correspondence: and invested with power to call other meetings whenever they shall think proper, viz:

Heidelberg Township: John Klop, John Tisher, (paper-maker) David Wenrich, John Sohl, Daniel Bechtel.

Reading: Joseph Heister Jr., Anthony Bichel, George D. B. Keim, Balthaser Smith, Judge Jacob Schneider.

Bern: Jacob Leinsbach, William Hehu, Peter Athaus.

Alsace: Henry Leinbach, Jacob Klohs, Jacob Gehret.

Lebanon county: John Batdorf, Esq. Adam Basslar, Leonard Ramler, Jacob Shitz, Jacob Hauk, Michael Moor, Geo. Becker, Peter Zeller, Jr.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the officers of the day, and published in all the papers friendly to the cause of the people.

JOSEPH MAIN, President.

HENRY BENNETSCH, JOHN GERHAND, } Vice Prest.

John Sohl, Jr. *Daniel Wenrich.* } Secretaries.

[Attached to the foregoing proceedings were the signatures of upwards of 150 very respectable persons of this county.]

FIRST UNIVERSALIST PREACHER.

We copy the following from the New-York Gospel Herald. The facts stated in it were new to us.

The first Universalist preacher in America was Dr. GEORGE DE BENNEVILLE. He was born in London, July 26th, 1703. His father was a distinguished French gentleman, who being persecuted on account of his religion, upon the invitation of King William retired to England and had a place provided at Court, for himself and family. His mother was of the celebrated Granville family. After the death of his father and mother, Queen Anne provided him with a nurse, and took the most tender care of him during his earlier years.

When about seventeen years of age he went to France to preach the glorious gospel of God our Saviour. Here he suffered a most cruel persecution from a proud and arrogant priesthood, and was at last condemned to die. He was conducted to the scaffold, and while the executioner was employed in binding his hands, a reprieve arrived from the King. He was conducted to prison, and was at last liberated through the intercession of the Queen.

After his release from confinement he retired into Germany, where he formed a very extensive acquaintance among the nobility of that country. Here his labours of love were abundantly blessed. Among the converts to the doctrine of Universal Salvation he mentions the Baron of Peuchink, the lords of Fleishbein, the Count of Marsey, &c. &c. His time was wholly occupied in preaching in the German, French, and Dutch languages in the various kingdoms of Germany, Holland, &c. After labouring incessantly in these countries for nearly twenty years, he came to America and settled in the state of Pennsylvania. His labours in various parts of this state were eminently successful. It was through him that Mr. Winchester was converted to a knowledge of the truth. He died universally lamented in the year 1793, aged 90 years. His descendants are among the most wealthy and respectable inhabitants in the state of Pennsylvania.

"We cannot avoid the belief that the heathen are exposed to eternal misery."

This is from a sermon of Rev. Francis Wayland, the Baptist President of Brown College, in Providence. The mere statement of such a doctrine, true as it may be on the calvinistick scheme, is enough to make sensible and benevolent men reject it. The poor, ignorant heathen, then, are to be made eternally miserable for not believing in Him of whom they never heard! for not embracing a religion they know nothing about! Abominable.—*Christian Intel.*

MOTTO.—The cellar or lower story of a Presbyterian Church in New-York city, is improved by a retailer as a dram shop, having a sign at the exteriour entrance, labelled in large capitals, "—— ——, DEALER IN PORTER, SPIRITS, CIGARS, &c." The Editor of the Evening Post thinks that the following Motto should be printed in as large letters over the church door, a few feet above the grocer's sign:—

There 's a Spirit above and a spirit below,
A Spirit of bliss and a spirit of woe;
The Spirit above is the Spirit Divine,
And the spirit below is the spirit of wine.

Poetick Department.

THE STRANGER AND HIS FRIEND.

BY JAMES MONTGOMERY.

A poor, wayfaring man of grief
Hath often crossed me on my way,
Who sued so humbly for relief
That I could never answer Nay;
I had not power to ask his name,
Whither he went or whence he came,
Yet there was something in his eye
That won my love—I know not why.

Once when my scanty meal was spread,
He entered; not a word he spake;
Just perishing for want of bread;
I gave him all; he blessed it, brake,
And ate, but gave me part again;
Mine was an angel's portion then,
And while I fed with eager haste,
The crust was manna to my taste.

I spied him where a fountain burst
Clear from the rock; his strength was gone;
The heedless water mocked his thirst,
He heard it, saw it hurrying on,
I ran and raised the sufferer up.
Thrice from the stream he drained my cup,
Dipt, and returned it, running o'er,
I drank, and never thirsted more.

'Twas night, the floods were out, it blew
A winter hurricane aloof;
I heard his voice abroad, and flew
To bid him welcome to my roof;
I warmed, I clothed, I cheered my guest,
I laid him on my couch to rest,
Then made the earth my bed, and seemed
In Eden's garden when I dreamed.

Stript, wounded, beaten nigh to death,
I found him by the highway side;
I roused his pulse, brought back his breath,
Revived his spirit, and supplied
Wine, oil, refreshment; he was healed;
—I had, myself a wound concealed,
But from that hour forgot the smart,
And peace bound up my broken heart.

In prison I saw him next—condemned
To meet a traitor's doom at morn;
The tide of lying tongues I stemmed,
And honored him 'midst shame and scorn.
My friendship's utmost zeal to try,
He asked—if I for him would die;
The flesh was weak, my blood run chill,
But the free spirit cried, "I will."

Then in a moment, to my view,
The stranger darted from disguise;
The tokens in his hands I knew;
My Saviour stood before my eyes,
He spake, and my poor name he named—
"Of me thou hast not been ashamed;
"These deeds shall thy memorial be;
"Fear not thou didst them unto me."

THE SISTERS.

They waked me from my sleep, I know not why,
And bade me haste where a pale, midnight lamp
Gleam'd from an inner chamber. There SHE lay
With ghastly brow, and wan dissevered lip,
Who erst with sunny tresses and bright smiles
Would breathe her superflux of health and bliss
Into the hearts of others. Lowly bent
Her hoary headed sire, fixing his gaze
Immovably upon his idol's brow,
As one astonished at his God's rebuke—
She too, whose fond, maternal breast sustained
That fair young creature in the morn of life,
Knelt at the couch's foot, with covered face.
While through her clasping fingers the big tears
Rolled forth profuse. The suffering one had give
The long farewell—and for the last, last time
Pressed her cold lips to his who led so late
Her footsteps to the altar, and received
In the deep gladness of an ardent heart
Her holy vow of love.

So there she lay
In calm endurance, like the smitten lamb
O'er whom the bitterness of death had past.
But a strange cry bust on the silent scene—
And in its nurse's arms a new born babe
Was brought, with pining and distressful look
Of utter helplessness. Oh God!—the change
That racked those marble features! Up she sprang
Clasping her hands with such convulsive force
That every fibre strained—while in low sobs
She pour'd the mother's deep prevailing prayer
Which conquers heaven—and as its cadence fell
Her spirit entered there.

Morn after morn
Rose and retired—and still as in a dream
I seemed to move. The certainty of loss
Fell not at once upon me. Then I wept
As weep the sisterless—For thou wert gone,
My only, my beloved, sainted one—
Twin of my spirit—and my numbered days
Must wear the mantle of that midnight hour
Which shut thee from me.

The Free Enquirer is somewhat irregular in its arrival, though we are assured by the editors it is regularly mailed. We have received only the first and second of Miss Wright's Lectures on Knowledge. We thought there were more. If there be, we will be much obliged to the editors if they will furnish the remainder. We have received most of the other numbers..

THE FOLLOWING BOOKS ARE FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Kneeland's Greek and Eng. Testament,
Do. Lectures,
Balfour's 1st and 2d Inquiry,
Do. Essays,
Do. Reply to Sabine,
Do. do. to Allen,
Ballou on Atonement,
Do. notes on Parables,
Light of Truth,
Canfield's Review,
Ancient History of Universalism, by H. Ballou 2d,
History of Universalism, by T. Brown.

Together with a variety of pamphlets published by distinguished Universalists. The above books are chiefly so well known that any recommendation from us would be superfluous. Ancient History of Universalism is a new work, and one which all classes of readers should be anxious to possess.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U.F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 1829. [NO. 17.

ADDRESS,

DELIVERED IN THE HALL OF SCIENCE, NEW-YORK, ON THE FOURTH OF JULY, 1829.

BY ROBERT DALE OWEN.

Man's life is a journey through motley prospects and changing scenes—a pilgrimage whose commencement is in ignorance and helplessness, and its termination in decay and death. And, as the traveller, when he has attained some projecting eminence, will pause, and look back with busy remembrance on the landscape that stretches behind him, then turn with eye of curiosity to trace through distant regions his yet untrodden pathway, so are there times and seasons when the pilgrim man, casting aside for a moment the bustling cares of existence, sits down to review the past and anticipate the future. If, as an ancient writer teaches, there be a time for every thing under the sun, what day to us so peculiarly marked for a resting place in life's long journey as this, the anniversary of American freedom—the birth day of our republic? If, for noble purpose and important resolve, all days be not alike, surely none so appropriate for these as the fourth of July—none when we are more especially called to retrospection and reflection—to fearless examination and to free enquiry.

On this day, when the busy stir of men, and the loud notes of rejoicing, recall to our memories and our hearts the blessings which a tameless spirit can will, and a bold venture can win, for an awakening people—on this day when our minds are elevated by generous recollections above the petty anxieties which too often make up the sum of human life and of human wishes, so that we may look down, as from a lofty station, far over the receding images of days gone by, and then glance through the shadowed but opening vista of times to come—on this stirring day, let us examine ourselves; let us examine the map of human improvement and enquire where, on that map, our place is to be found; let us enquire what we have gained, what we have yet to gain; how far we have ventured towards human independence, and where our hesitating steps have been staid.

It is not for me to take the lead in a discussion that might furnish theme for deepest reflection to the wisest and most experienced among us all. But since circumstance has assigned me this station to-day, permit me a few observations, such as may suggest to your after thoughts subjects for interesting enquiry, or, perchance, of important research.

Fifty-three years ago your fathers made a mighty stride towards human liberty and happiness. They asserted their political independence, and obtained it. They asserted and obtained, not, indeed, *mental* independence—for the tyrant's chain cannot reach the mind, nor can the patriot's sword sever mental fetters—but they asserted and obtained freedom of speech and of action, political and social. In that one boon, how many thousand blessings are involved! By that one act how many thousand prejudices and oppressions loosened or removed!

My friends! we have yet to learn how many. We have yet to learn—in practice, at least, if not in theory—what *are* the rights for which your fathers bled. The revolution in our minds has not kept pace with the revolution of our circumstances. We have riches beyond our knowledge to estimate, and privileges beyond our experience to employ. Like some young and thoughtless heir to his father's fortune, we look at the glorious inheritance our ancestors bequeathed to us, with a vague feeling of pride and pleasure, indeed, but without any true estimation of the resources it contains, or the rights and powers it bestows.

Thus is our nation poor, even in the midst of riches; and dependant, even after she has won her independence. True it is, that hers is not now the dependance of strong handed power, but only of weak minded fear; yet, wherever its source, it is dependance still; and only the more deeply rooted, perhaps, because it grows but in the depths of the mind; and because, even while we feel its influence, we would fain forget its existence.

I would not seem to judge harshly, nor to assert without proof. Yet surely, even in the hearts of those that listen, is proof of my asser tion to be found.

Ye have, by the declaration of '76, political independence; ye have liberty of conscience; ye have freedom of speech. Ye may declare yourselves presbyterians, methodists, catholics, socinians, universalists, friends, deists, materialists, Christians, Jews, Mahometans, or pagans; ye may reverence the first or the seventh day of the week, or no day at all; ye may sacrifice to Allah, or to Jehovah, or to Juggernaut's idol, or ye may abstain from all sacrifices; ye may pray in English or in Latin, in publick, or in private, or neither; ye may go

to church, or to chapel, or to hall of science, or ye may stay at home. Ye may assert that the Bible was written by the world's creator, or that it was written by we know not whom; that its precepts are divine or immoral; its influence benign or pernicious; its proofs perfect or baseless; its origin in ignorance, or in omniscience. All this, and much more, ye may do and say, and the strong arm of the law dare take no cognizance of these your words or actions, whether wise or foolish, tolerant or fanatick.

We possess, then, freedom of conscience; we may speak as we list, and worship, or not worship, as we please; we have the right so to do, and the law recognizes our right in principle and in practice; else were not I, the sceptical editor of the Free Enquirer, here to-day to speak, nor you to listen. But we *have* liberty of conscience; we may speak, we may write, we may act, in religious or irreligious matters, as to us seems best; and though men and women may stare and wonder, and keep aloof, yet the most zealous bigot in America can neither touch our lives, nor our liberties, nor our purse strings. The law of this republick can no more command, or forbid, either to orthodoxy or to atheism, than she can dictate to you or to me, what we shall eat, or what we shall drink, or what shall be the colour of our clothing.

But what the law dares not, publick opinion dares and does; not that noble publick opinion that taught Sparta's sons their hardihood, and Rome's citizens their self devotion, but the wayward offspring of fashion and fear, whose law is caprice, and her decisions injustice; that false and intolerant publick opinion, which weighs actions by their popularity, and not by their effects; which bids us do that which is customary, rather than that which is right, and holds out to the envious and the selfish a premium on slander—in that she assists the vicious hypocrite to build up a white-washed reputation on the ruins of better characters and purer lives than his own.

This dishonest and capricious publick opinion it is, that sits like an incubus on our boldest thoughts and best exertions. She it is that makes cowards even of the brave—slaves of freemen; that checks the progress of virtue and the spread of knowledge; that darkens the land with her prejudices, and chills the heart with her cold decrees. She it is, that disfigures the fair edifice which half a century ago, your fathers founded; that would, even now, with self constituted power and presumptuous assurance, set aside the decisions of revolutionary wisdom;—nay, that would reach, with impious hand, at the dearest rights which the charter of our liberties contains.

Shall I offend if I speak yet more plainly? Shall I give pain or arouse the resentment if I venture the assertion that here at this moment, even in this Hall, consecrated to freedom, to tolerance, and to truth, the false enchantress has cast her spell and asserts her power?

I trust that I shall not offend. When I remind you that you fear publick opinion, even when most unjust, and that though you may despise, you cannot defy her, I but assert that which all confess, even while they lament it. Nor let us lament it as an evil unmixed. This same petty tyrant that can frown down gentle virtue, and laugh at conscientious scruple—that gives to intolerance her sting, and to prejudice her victory—this same wayward and reckless child might be—nay, one day she *will* be, the great presiding genius whose mild and unresisted influence shall supercede laws and oaths and ceremonies—ay, and shall give birth to virtues which laws cannot create; to integrity which oaths cannot assure; to fidelity which ceremonies can never engender.

But while we may joyfully anticipate the virtuous reign of publick opinion when she shall be directed in honesty and trained to intelligence, let us not forget her malignant influence *now*. Let us not accord that respect—no, nor that obedience—to her caprices, which her justice only ought to obtain. She is, and she ought to be treated, as a spoilt child; not harshly reproved, for that were but to irritate; nor rudely contradicted, for that were to enrage her. But neither should we encourage her follies, nor sooth her petted temper by yielding submission. Publick opinion must learn, that in her injustice she is *not* omnipotent; that her idle whims are not to become laws for mankind, nor her rainbow fancies to be reverenced as an oracle's commands. Publick opinion must be taught, that if she will retain her power, she must reform her character. She must be made to feel, that to be respected, she must first be respectable; and that to be respectable, she must be reasonable, tolerant, without respect of persons, a lover of honesty, a friend of reform, an enemy of hypocrisy, an encourager of free enquiry.

Is this her character? Is publick opinion reasonable, when she requires despotick, unqualified submission? Is she tolerant when she smiles on orthodoxy because it *is* orthodoxy, and frowns on heresy because it *is* heresy? Does she not respect persons? Does she not heap on honesty the most unseemly abuse? Does she encourage rational reform, either in such trifles as the form and texture of our garments, or in the weightier matters of politicks, of religion, of morality? Does she not daily, hourly, hold out golden premiums for hypocrisy, and threaten excommunication to each bold enquirer after truth.

Permit one other question. Whimsical, unjust, intolerant, immoral as publick opinion is, do not even those that now hear me, bend the spirit and bow the knee in her presence? Do ye always speak as ye believe? Do ye at all times act in conformity with your honest con-

viction? Do ye openly, simply avow all your conscientious heresies? In a word do ye assert the rights which the fathers of our revolution bequeathed, and which publick opinion denies to you?

It is an important question. Let us put it to our own hearts, and answer it to our own consciences. This is a sceptical age, a day of reform and improvement, a time when spirits are tried and creeds are tested. Some of us *have* changed our belief; all *may* change it ere long. It behoves us, then, especially to enquire whether, if not in the law, there be in custom, a statute against consistency; and if there be, whether honest citizens must obey it, and thus play the hypocrite to preserve their reputations.

It is an important question—one of the most important that can be asked or answered. DOES CUSTOM COMMAND US TO BE INCONSISTENT? AND, IF SHE DOES MUST WE OBEY THE COMMAND?

The question touches on rights and usages which have obtained the sanction, if sanction it be, of time and habit. But so also were the national oppressions sanctioned, which your fathers examined and resisted fifty years ago. Suffer me, then, on this anniversary of your political heresy, to request your patient hearing, your undivided attention, while together we examine what are the decrees of this social tyrant, and whether we will have her to reign over us.

There is one great subject that absorbs much of human time and thoughts, and diverts from its earthly channel much of human labour. I mean religion.

Religion's orthodox ministers tell us, that this is not our appointed abode, but only a valley of cares and sorrows—a thorny pathway that leads to another and a better world. They tell us, that while here we exist but fourscore or fivescore years, in celestial regions we shall live for ever. And further they tell us, that the unspeakable joys or the unspeakable torments of eternity, are already prepared for every one of us, and that on our belief and our piety during our pilgrimage here, hangs our everlasting destiny.

There is another class of men, called scepticks, who do not perceive how we can obtain any knowledge regarding celestial countries, and their inhabitants; and who believe that, though our human opinions and actions most essentially influence our destiny in this world, there is no reason to imagine that they will affect our future being in any other.

These differences of opinion are not of one nation nor of any age. They pervade the whole earth; and have long divided, as they still divide, the earth's inhabitants into two separate classes, the labourer for time, and the labourer for eternity.

We had proposed to examine whether publick opinion allows the citizens of this free country to be consistent. In testing the question, we cannot, perhaps, select a more universal and important, consequently a more appropriate subject, than this of religion. We will enquire, therefore, whether, as regards this great religious question, custom permits consistency.

Let me remind you that our present enquiry has nothing to do with the truth or the falsehood of religion. However important that question, it is not the question we have now to discuss. The sceptick assumes one principle of conduct, the religionist another, so diametrically opposite, that it is marvel they can both occupy the same world, without reciprocally, thinking each other madmen. But we have not to examine which of these opposing principles is true. We have only to enquire whether publick opinion permits both, or either of these professors, to act consistently with their profession.

First, then, the religionist—that is, the man who considers earth only as a preparing place for heaven. The consistent religionist reminds us that our life is but as a vapour that appeareth for a little, and then vanisheth away. He bids us not be cumbered nor troubled about many things, but to devote our time, our talents, our money, our influence, every thing that we are and have, to the one thing needful, a preparation for the kingdom of God; not, like Ananias and Sapphira to give a part and withhold the rest, but to give ALL, every cent of our property every shade of our thoughts, every moment of our time, every atom of our exertions, every particle of our influence in society. He bids us *not* labour for the meat that perisheth, but for the glory that never fades. He bids us take thought for no morrow but the morrow of eternity. He bids us spurn and despise the sublunary sphere, that we may seek and win a nobler inheritance. He shows us all the kingdoms of the world and the glory thereof, the riches and the honours, the pleasures, the griefs, the hopes, the fears, the dreams of human improvement, and the struggles for human happiness, the deep affections for human bosoms, and the high-toned earthly virtues of human hearts—all these he shows, and bids us scorn them all—bids us fling them behind us as less than vanity—as idle meteors that cross our heavenly path to lure from the bright and peaceful resting place that is prepared for us beyond the grave. We are creatures of heaven, he tells us, not of earth; pilgrims kept back from our native land; wanderers, tempted and suffering until we reach our glorious and eternal home. We are not mortal men, we are undying spirits; not children of time, but sons and daughters of immortality. Our existence here with all its checkered scenes, is lighter in the scales of reason, than the dust of the balance; emptier than the fountain's bubble; less than the least of all worthless trifles. "Why will ye labour in vain?" he exclaims. "Why will

ye care for the fleeting days of your mortal life? Will ye imitate the misnamed benefactors of their race, they who have spent time and substance to fathom the depths of human science, or pour the wine and oil of comfort into the wounds of human sorrow? Vain, idle triflers! What do ye purpose? What can ye gain? Perfect happiness to mortal worms throughout the span of their pigmy existence? And *if* ye gain it? Is this your calculation, ye labourers for a worthless moment? this the great object that is to engross the thoughts of an heir of paradise? Unworthy and blind! When will ye know your heavenly natures? When arrest your grovelling earthly pursuits? When cease from labours that befit not the sons of God? When will ye learn that he who saves an immortal soul, has created by that single act more of happiness—myriads of times told—than all the kindest and best affections of human nature have ever produced since the world first arose out of chaos, or ever will produce, until the great day of judgement? When, in very deed, ye know and feel all this, then will ye labour for that which profiteth; ye will make this world a nursery for another, and change all the idle trades and vain occupations of bustling time, into one great, untiring school of preparation for eternity. Then shall the earth be the Lord's, and the fullness thereof. Its business shall be the Lord's business, its hopes and wishes the Lord's pleasure; all its songs, songs of praise, and all its inhabitants, priests of the Most High. Earth shall be as it ought to be, only a stepping stone, by which to climb into heaven."

Thus speaks consistent religion. And, thus—ay, and much more strongly—she ought to speak. If her credentials are genuine, they give her *all* power, in heaven above, and on the earth beneath. If she can demand any thing, she can demand—it is her *duty* to demand—THE WHOLE. If she stop short of this she trifles with her duty.

Does popular opinion stop short of this? Ask yourselves, my friends. Ye have been to church and to chapel: what did ye hear there? When those who proclaim themselves servants of the Deity and guides to realms above, rose to address ye, what was there tone and language? Was it the tone of men on whose words hang all our happiness and all our misery? Did they speak the language of bold honest consistency? Did they bid ye forsake all to follow religion? Did they ask for every dollar ye possessed to save souls? Did they claim every hour of your time? did they bid ye cease from care for food and raiment, those vanities after which the gentiles seek? Did they forbid ye to sow, or to reap, or to gather into barns? Did they remind ye that your heavenly father, who takes thought for the lilies of the valley and the grass of the field, will much more take thought for you? Did they point to the carnal business that throngs our streets and crowds our market place, and remind ye that it is but the service of Mammon? then bid ye choose between the two masters, God and Mammon—between the two inheritances, this world and another? Did they expose to you the idle folly—the *wickedness* of halting between two opinions? Did they bid ye draw the great line and take sides—for time, or for eternity? In a word, when they claimed your gifts, your thoughts, and your exertions, did they demand—as duty and consistency bade them demand—THE WHOLE? *Dared* they demand it? *Dared* they do their duty? *Dared they be consistent?*

In one sense they surely dared. The law permitted it. They might have spoken, as honest religionists ought; and there is no statute in our land that would have punished their consistency. But publick opinion was there—she that reigns in the temple of religion, as in the mart of commerce. The minister of religion felt, even in his own sanctuary, that honestly to claim his acknowledged rights and his consistent privileges, was to risk his power and his popularity. He claimed them not. He bowed to publick opinion, and sacrificed consistency.

Truly, publick opinion is a wayward child, even to her favourite orthodoxy—she, whom she supports with money and influence—she, whose saintly credentials she has signed and recognized—she, whose faults she overlooks, and whose very follies she praises—even to this indulged favourite, to whom she accords every other privilege, she will not permit consistency. Little wonder, then, that what she refuses even to favored orthodoxy, she will not permit to neglected scepticism.

The sceptick's duty is plain and simple. Knowing this world only he turns his thoughts and talents to examine its capabilities and improve its condition. Professing no power to save immortal souls, he turns his attention to the melioration of man's temporal condition. He labours for food and raiment, because he believes not the promise that if he seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, all these things will be added to him. He sows and reaps, and gathers into barns, because though the fowls of the air live without industry, he is not a fowl of the air and cannot exist as they do. He prizes earthly affections, because he knows no holier source of happiness. He respects earthly virtues, because he conceives of no greater. He is not a restless wanderer here but a permanent inhabitant; and, as such, he is encouraged to make permanent improvements; he takes pleasure in putting in order and adorning his worldly inheritance, even for the short period of eighty or one hundred years; seeing that whether long or short, it is all he has to provide for. If he succeed in rendering earth happy, and if he can increase the intelligence and add to the comforts of his fellows here, he is pleased and contented; because he

looks no farther. He tests the virtue or vice of actions, not by their efficacy in working out eternal salvation, but by their temporal effects on the minds and bodies of men and women. That which brings calm enjoyment to the senses and peace to the bosom, he feels to be right; that which injures the body or the mind, or which disturbs the tranquility of the heart, he perceives to be wrong; and he has no other standard. He has no after reckoning beyond the grave to confuse his temporal calculations. His duties are confined to the earth and its inhabitants. He never labours for eternity, because he knows not how to do so He never addresses spirits of the air, nor discusses their plans, nor imagines their pleasure; because he has never seen, and is not acquainted with them.

It might seem that in the case of a creed so simple and unassuming as this, there was scarcely a pretence for the interference of publick opinion. And, if scepticism had been as great a favourite as orthodoxy, she would probably have been permitted to be consistent to her creed, without remark or molestation. As it is, however, the very diffidence of the sceptick, in the absence of other cause for accusation, is brought up in judgement against him. It is in vain he acknowledges his ignorance and incapacity on spiritual subjects; it is vain he confesses, that if others have been made the confidants of a great immaterial spirit, he has not been so fortunate; and that, if to others heavenly secrets have been revealed, from him they have been hidden. His very modesty is construed into a crime; and public opinion plainly tells him, that, whether spiritually short sighted or not, if he cannot see as far as his neighbours, he incurs God's penalty and man's displeasure.

Man's legal penalty, indeed, he no longer incurs. There are no burnings for heresy in this country, nor even a thumbscrew to constrain belief; our declaration of independence provided against that. Heterodox free enquiry lives and thrives, even under the very eye of orthodoxy; and incurs neither prosecution nor penalty. But that is not the fault of public opinion. She has done what she could to prevent it; and if she failed, it was because the power, and not because the will, was found wanting.

Thus, to the zealous religionist and to the unassuming sceptic, consistency is equally prohibited. Neither may freely follow up their principles without incurring whatever her angry caprice can effect against them. Either, indeed, may escape the thraldom, if they will. The servant of the temple might demand all to which his sacred character (if it be sacred at all) entitles him. But both alike incur danger by such consistent honesty; the religionist, danger of forfeiting his station and influence, and of being called a mad enthusiast; and the sceptic, danger of loosing his livelihood, and of being called a child of the devil.

We have an answer, then, to the first clause of our question: "Does custom command us to be inconsistent?" She does; most positively; most imperatively. Be we infidels, or be we believers, she equally commands it; and, if we are consistent, it is in open defiance of her prohibition.

For the second clause of the question, "must we obey the command?" it is not so easily answered. It cannot be answered, by one man or woman for another. Each must count the cost, and draw the line for himself.

Some men depend upon public opinion for the bread they eat; and men cannot live without bread. Some have families which they cannot support without public opinion's assistance; and a man may not stand by and see his children starve. Some are constrained to silence, or to deceit, by less honest and urgent motives. They have a certain rank to sustain in society, and public opinion must aid them to sustain it. They have an office to obtain, and public opinion must give them her votes. Or, perhaps, they like crowded balls and fashionable parties, and public opinion must help to fill them. Or, they like a quiet life and an unimpeached reputation, and would fain bribe public opinion to let them alone.

Under these circumstances, each must judge for himself. Each must weigh the cost against the good to be purchased; and decide whether he will make the purchase or not. A clear conscience is an excellant thing; but then the price! Men must live, and men like to live well.

Yet, to those who are willing to sacrifice something for a great and good object, and to barter riches and popularity for moral independence—to them I would, in conclusion, address a few words.

If any change for the better is to be made, it must have a commencement. If any abuses are to be reformed, somebody must begin the reform. If publick opinion, when unjust and immoral in her dictates, is not to be obeyed, some one must venture the disobedience. If it is to become fashionable to be consistent, some one must set the fashion. In short, if the work of human independence is to go on, we must be up and doing.

Let us bestir ourselves, then. Let us be bold, be active. Let us obey not the self constituted power of a capricious dictator, but the honest monitor within our own breast. Let us not fear to be called, nor even to be thought, religious enthusiasts or irreligious hereticks; but let us fear to *be* deceitful or depraved, in word or action. While we insult not public opinion, neither let us cringe to her. Let us yield obedience only when we can yield respect. Let us submit, only when reason and virtue approve the submission.

Thus shall public opinion learn, that if she will reign at all, it must be as a reasonable le-

gislator, not as a wilful mistress. And we shall obtain, in very deed, for ourselves and our descendants, those costly rights which, first asserted on the great day of our independence, and dearly purchased with danger and blood, are yet at this hour capriciously denied to us, their legitimate possessors.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

W. I. REESE.

On another page will be found a second letter from this esteemed brother in the ministry—and we congratulate our readers on the amicable and speedy conclusion to which this controversy is likely to be brought. Mr. R. says our reply to his letter "is, for the most part, satisfactory, at least so far as to answer every important object." He says he is satisfied that we believe in the existence of God as revealed in the scriptures and in the Gospel of Christ." This he also "adds is enough." We have then so far as he is concerned redeemed our pledge.

Mr. R. intimates he considered some parts of our reply "bitter," and that we indulged in "personal reflections." He may be right. We have a little too much of *the priest* hanging around us to be always as liberal as we wish. But Br. Reese is assured, if our letter contained ought of bitterness or personal invective, it was not intended. We did indeed intimate that it was possible personal feelings might have dictated the letter to which we replied, for such was our belief. We could mention a long train of circumstances which led us almost irresistibly to that conclusion. But we forbear. The frankness of this second letter has given us pleasure by fully removing that illusion and by convincing us he was actuated by purer motives, motives in themselves perfectly just.

About what he says we told him were once our sentiments, we can only reply, it has escaped our recollection as well as a great many other things which we have been accused of saying during the period to which he alludes.

The Editor will assure Mr. Reese, he never was, to his knowledge an *avowed* Atheist, nor to his recollection has he ever told any one any thing from which he could infer it. There was a period in his youth, when pursuing his studies that he doubted the existence of God, and those doubts would still remain, were he convinced no revelation from God to man, had ever been made. Though it is admitted nature, with few exceptions, presents the phenomena we might suppose it would have presented had it been the work of an intelligent Being, yet the real philosopher asks something more than this conjecture to afford just grounds of faith.

The Christian contemplates nature as the work of an intelligent, all powerful and benevolent Being.—Whatever he sees serves to illustrate the attributes of this Being and lead the soul to worship and adore.—The philosopher looks on nature as a collection, or vast assemblage, of phenomena. His object is to ascertain by experiment and observation of what changes, whether in reference to time or to space, these are susceptible, or what change they do actually undergo. He attempts to account for nothing, he labours to *explain* nothing, his province is to tell us the things which *are*, and *how* these things can be made subservient to human preservation and human felicity—such is the Christian, such is the philosopher, the editor of the Gospel Advocate has laboured to unite the two characters.

Mr. R. thinks we are not sufficiently reverent, that we make light of sacred things. Our lamp is not a "human skull" nor do we live constantly among tombs. We respect every one's feelings, but as we are not conscious of having trifled with things holy we can promise on this point no reformation.

Phrenologists have never been able to discover, on our head, any remarkable BUMP for reverence, and we are perfectly willing to admit we are not over and above stocked with that virtue. We like to call things by right names, and have yet to learn that in order to be religious we must draw down our face and twist our mouth out of its proper shape, whenever we pronounce the name of our Creator. Somebody said, (a certain French Duke we believe) that "gravity is a mysterious garb invented to cover the deformity of the heart," and in ninety nine cases out of a hundred the remark will prove true. We duly appreciate friend Reese's gravity, but do not wish to doom a fellow being to hell because he sometimes smiles. We are sufficiently wretched, and Heaven forbid we should rail at one, who is fortunate enough to forget his sufferings, and who has philosophy enough to smile in the midst of his cares and anxieties.

Mr. Reese says we misrepresented him in one particular. We must plead guilty, but in palliation of our crime, alledge that in an article of his, Gospel Adv. Vol. 5. page 38, we found the sentiment which we ascribed to him. In this article we discovered no limitation, and we were so deeply impressed with the *gravity* of the writer that we deemed ourselves too *light* to read further. Consequently we had never read the second article, where we find the limitation expressed in due form. Br. Reese will pardon us. It was all owing to the great *weight* of his articles which so overpowered our mercurial spirits, that we could never read them without an intolerable propensity to drowsiness. The articles of brother Reese to which we allude are, however, really excellent, and from a perusal of them, which we have effected with no less pleasure than profit, we are satisfied of their orthodoxy and are convinced our former opinions respecting the merit and sentiments of the articles, were drawn from too slight an acquaintance with what he had written. We shall study to avoid such errours in future.

We now dismiss this subject returning our sincere thanks to Mr. Reese for the trouble he has taken to enlighten our readers. We entreat him to keep an eye on us, whenever we wander, he will please signify it not only to *ourself* but to our readers. We thank him for his kindness. We think the controversy will be productive of good. Our readers will learn more

correctly our sentiments, and we are happy to find some of our suspicions respecting brother Reese, were unjust to him. The cloud of scepticism which was supposed to hang over the Gospel Advocate is dispelled. We can now breathe freely and we hope we shall enjoy the blessings of the sun of peace.

We have no enmity to any one of the human family, and we heed not the abuse they may fling upon us. We have embarked in the search after truth, in the attempt to emancipate the human family. We regret the partners of the voyage should find cause to contend angrily with each other. We have at times felt alone. We have had not only to struggle with the enemy of our common cause but with those who should have held up our hands. Yet we have not been alone. We have warm friends and they are numerous—friends who would not say to the active mind in pursuit of truth, "Hitherto shalt thou come but no further." It is on these we rely. Proffering brotherly love to all we shall bow implicitly to none. Charitable to all sects we disclaim the membership of any, willing to learn from all we shall always abide our own judgement. EDITOR.

REVIEW OF AMICUS, NO. 3.

In the present number of our paper, will be found a fourth communication from Amicus. It contains not many good things, nor many bad things. Its subject matter is trifling and the words, in which it is expressed, are indifferently enough thrown together. It would have been published and passed by without notice, had not the writer, suspecting his opponent was about to leave the field, assumed a degree of courage very unbecoming a young priest in disguise.

We never assumed a warlike aspect. The remarks of ours, which seem to have given new life to Amicus, were founded upon the fact, that we had many subjects to treat, and that we did not choose to waste many words with a writer, who could have little success in making proselytes, and who could not be refuted until he advanced some position tangible to the mind. Our columns were open to his productions, for, although he was generally vague and not unfrequently erroneous, his articles contained many good things, and as we considered him a young writer, and partly opposed to us, we were willing to encourage him what we could.

But he now manifests a disposition to brand us recreant, declares we are no true knight, &c. We have little of the spirit or the language of the chivalrick ages, and if we had, it has not yet appeared that we should receive any peculiar honour or lasting fame from an encounter with Amicus. We profess little acquaintance with the arms of the tournement, and though we would never refuse a courteous challenge from a good knight and true, we shall not regard with particular attention him who evidently has only one spur to his heels. Amicus should know it is no part of a true knight to exult over his fallen opponent; and certainly, it seems very awkward in him to reserve the exhibition of his prowess, until his opponent, waiting in vain for the attack, retires in disgust from the lists. Let our Sir Knight Incognito reflect, it may be time to grant quarters when his opponent shall ask, and soon enough to boast of victory when to the poignard of mercy he yields himself vanquished.

The remainder of his article does not merit a reply. The conclusions, he has drawn from our reasoning, are unwarranted, and, if warranted, avail him nothing until he shows Faith may not be exercised in another world as well as in this. If he does not believe the means of holiness are confined to this life, and he intimates he does not, he must admit the Gospel can be efficacious after death as well as before, unless indeed, he supposes there are other means than those in the Gospel by which we can be made holy. But this he denies. There is no other name, he contends by which men can be saved, and he has proved himself priest, in sentiment at least, by his pious warning to us not to expect happiness from any other than the "Dear Redeemer." Let him solve the difficulty for himself.

He has his hobby, imputed righteousness; perhaps he may become righteous, if some other being's righteousness be imputed to him.—We wish to have some righteousness of our own. We consider the Gospel designed, not to make another's righteousness answer instead of ours, but to make us righteous; and we think it will eventually make all righteous. If Amicus considers us wrong, let his objections come in a tangible shape and if we do not meet him "boldly and bravely" then let him brand us recreant. Come forth Sir Knight, prove your courage, let us know with what skill you can "break a lance or wield a sword."

CHURCH AND STATE.—NO. 4.

But few facts are required to establish what has been asserted respecting the disposition of the clergy. If they are suspected of aiming at the supreme control of all matters, whether of church or state, a slight view of their profession will render it impossible to separate this disposition from their own views and feelings in reference to their duty.

The clerical office is different in kind from all others. The clergyman does not receive his appointment from man; he bows to no human tribunal; he acknowledges no human laws as equal to those he is entrusted to enforce: pleading the appointment of the Almighty as the warrant of his authority, he holds, as he imagines, the laws of God—laws which all earth and all heaven are bound to obey. He stands commissioned from the court of heaven—a court to which all earthly courts must bow. Placed thus high above all human

authority, all civil governments must be the ministers of his will; and all kings, rulers and magistrates, must be his waiting boys.

The clergyman fancies himself the ambassador of God; clothed with divine authority, he comes wrapt in the dignity of heaven; he claims all the submission due to the majesty of his master, and all the attention and deference due to the sacredness and the high importance of his mission. He comes not to negociate peace between contending rivals, but, as the minister of the lawful sovereign who has regained his throne, to proclaim terms to defeated rebels; not to persuade, but to command them to ground the weapons of their rebellion and to return to their duty; to submit themselves to their rightful sovereign against whom they had rebelled.

He considers all men in a state of rebellion, and that they must support the church of God before they can be treated as lawful subjects. His message is—"Children of men! hear the words of the Almighty King. You have rebelled against your sovereign, you have leagued with his enemies, you have attempted to wrest from his hand the sceptre of command, you have laboured to dethrone him, and you have trampled his laws under your feet. In this state of rebellion you are entitled to no mercy, are deserving no compassion. But the King, your legitimate sovereign, is no tyrant. He has declared your death, but he will spare you if you will submit; if you accept the offers he makes, you are reprieved—you are pardoned. Throw down your arms; trust yourself to his mercy; support the church which he has planted as a rallying point for all who will return to their duty, and all shall be well; flock to this standard, the standard of the rightful Lord and of the true God, and your rebellion shall be forgotten, your sins blotted out."

From this message, which every clergyman feels himself commissioned to deliver, it is evident that to support the church is the duty of all, as the only sure test of their obedience to God. From this we learn that the church is deemed superiour to the state, and certainly its officers superiour to the officers of civil government. All are bound to obey God, rulers as well as people: to obey God, we must support the church; and as the clergy are the officers of the church, as they are the ministers of God, the interpreters of his will, the ones he makes use of in his intercourse with the human family, therefore, by a slight change of terms, the whole comes to this conclusion;—to obey God is to support the church; to obey, or to support the church, is to consult the will of the clergy, and to yield implicit obedience to their commands.

Such is the dignity and high authority with which the clergyman fancies himself clothed, that it is impossible he should deem it proper for him to sanction the measures adopted by a rebel government, and in his estimation every government is rebellious that does not support what he believes the cause of God. With these feelings, can he deem it wrong to advise those rebel governours or rulers of their duty? or *compel* them to perform it, when they will not be persuaded? Certainly not. He is appointed God's vicegerent on earth; it is his duty to be faithful to his master, and he would feel self-condemned should he neglect to make governments as well as people obey the will of heaven.

And why should it be considered strange that clergymen should have the disposition with which they are charged, when the very warrant they plead, when the charter of their order imperiously requires them to exercise it? It would be strange, indeed, if the confidants of the Almighty, persons acquainted even with his *secret* will—individuals whom he has called and qualified with the effusion of his spirit to lead men to heaven, and to be the instruments of their eternal salvation—it would be strange, indeed, that they should have no desire to direct us in our duty here, and instruct us in what relates to this world as well as what relates to another; and it might seem strange we should distrust those who enjoy the confidence of the Omniscient God, or that we should obey them less in reference to time than to eternity.

The message of the clergyman has been stated; let it be more particularly examined. According to all his preaching, the first duty of the people is to "seek the kingdom of God." This, by a liberal translation, is the "church militant." The people must take little thought for this world—they must fix their thoughts on eternity—remember this is not their abiding place, that there is in eternity a blest city, and that it should be their principal object to enquire by what means they can receive, in that happy place, a mansion of felicity for themselves. Towards this object, as the magnet of the soul, it is said every desire should point; and to gain it, no sacrifice should be deemed too great—no, not the loss of a right eye, a right hand, or even of life itself.

As the means to gain this, every body knows, the church must be supported. This being the temple of God, whatever gift made to it, whatever obedience is paid to its mandates, God accepts as if done to himself, and will amply reward us for it in the eternal world. It is therefore we are commanded to support the church. It is the visible glory of God; by supporting it we glorify God. Hence it is, we are to give to the church, and to give as we shall wish we had given when we come to die. Hence the frequency with which the clergy dwell on this theme; and hence, too, the liberality which the pious, and the devout, and the sinner, about to die, anxious to atone

for a misspent life, manifest in their donations. For the whole of man's duty may be summed up in a word, "support the church."

But this duty is binding on men in their collective as well as in their individual capacity; on rulers as well as upon the ruled; upon all in authority, as well as upon those who must obey: and as all authority is from God, and as all rulers hold their power as a trust from him, they are bound to exercise it according to his will, to use all for his glory. Now, as the clergy are the appointed interpreters of the divine will, and as they claim to be sole directors in all matters relating to his glory, the whole resolves itself into this conclusion;—"All rulers are bound to obey what the clergy tell them is the will of God, and to do what *they* declare will be for his glory."

Hence it is easy to perceive that the profession of the clergy naturally generates the disposition with which they are charged; and it requires no peculiar intellectual acuteness to discover that when a clergyman has a selfish or ambitious spirit, he may hide under the duties of his profession the worst and the most dangerous designs. It has already been shown that the clergy have never been wanting in the disposition to make the sanctity of their profession subservient to individual aggrandizement; and it seems proper they should exhibit strong proofs of a reformation, before they can make the judicious believe they will not conduct in the same manner again. If honest in his profession, the priest must have the disposition with which he is charged: he cannot think it wrong for him to control civil government, for he is above it, and the glory of God requires him to do it; if dishonest, nothing better can be expected, and none who have any discernment will consider themselves more safe.

Such are the clergy, such their profession: let their conduct now pass in review. The last 25 years have been a busy time with the priesthood—years of great activity, of great mental agitation—years replete with danger, and it is hoped they will not prove barren of instruction. Every engine seems to have been put in motion; every machine which clerical ingenuity could construct has been put in operation; and every method which could reinstate the clergy in their lost possessions, and re-establish an odious hierarchy, degrading to the name of religion, and disgraceful to the people who will bear it, has been adopted, and with no small success.

It will be unnecessary to run over all their arts and machinations. As one proof of their wishes, and strongly presumptive of their designs, our readers are referred to a CIRCULAR which the orthodox handed round among those of their own stamp. It is three or four years since it found its way into the publick journals, and we are satisfied its authenticity is beyond a doubt, and its genuineness no subject of dispute. The orthodox are charged with it, and they have never, to our knowledge, denied it. A few extracts will show its spirit and its object.

After touching lightly upon the apparent union which then existed among several denominations of christians, upon the *brotherly love*, upon the awakened zeal and extended religious impressions occasioned by Theological Seminaries, Bible, Missionary, and Tract Societies, and the probable blessings which were to flow from the establishment of the *National* Tract Society at New-York, under the united care and superintendence of the most distinguished clergy of various denominations, it proceeds:

"From this view of sentiment and feeling, Students of different persuasions can meet and read the same same religious authors, in the same Institutions, under the same Professors for the acquisition of Theological knowledge. Thus, while errours and corruptions are detected and exposed, will correct and orthodox religious sentiments be promulgated and defended by learned Students employed in the same holy and divine calling, for one common purpose. It is by these means, we see so many of our first men becoming converts, more and more to the Christian faith, and devoted to the interests of Bible, Missionary, and Tract Societies. At the seat of the General Government, we see Congress electing Chaplains in rotation, to offer up prayers for the success of their deliberations. While we witness such concert among the higher orders of society, as to religious worship, with a favourable disposition to the distribution of Religious Tracts, properly composed, we have a good right to conclude it will *issue in a wise National Creed*, and that the most pious and enlightened men in our country will see the impropriety of sending out Missionaries and Divines to preach the Word of Life with discordant and conflicting views."

"This pious unanimity and zeal will be apt to produce its own temporal reward. See the want of it in the late war, when the influence of many disaffected Clergymen was powerfully and successfully exerted to paralyze the energy and operations of government. They were not then allowed to feel and enjoy the benefits which their religious labours might confer on their country. Since, their station has become more respected;—the most respectable layman feels himself honoured to join the Presbyterian and Baptist, the Episcopalian and Methodist, assembled together to deliberate on the best means which their joint councils may suggest for the extension of religious knowledge. The Clerical robe is becoming less the theme of scoffers, and more and more a proud and honourable badge to him, who, for his Theological attainments is entitled to it.

"By enlisting moral and religious, and consequently numerical force, in the cause of Religion, all the opposition of infidelity will be borne down and overpowered. Until those collisions and conflicts of opinion, growing out of the same Christian belief, shall be annihilated or greatly abated, our country, in times of distress and danger may be divided and distracted by religious feuds and quarrels. The business of Government ought, as much as possible, and may be practicable, to produce unanimity and concord, both in our civil and religious institutions.

"As sure as the force of circumstances produces order and system in the world, and as sure as there is a tendency and gravitation in natural and physical bodies towards each other, so sure, in the moral and religious world, will the lesser bodies or sects be attracted to the largest. Among refractory and apostate spirits, opposition may be expected, *but it will be made to yield to the power and influence of evangelical truth.*

"A reference to the state of Christianity in England, furnishes an ample solution to this position. A great majority of the people there are reconciled to the established order, and unite in giving their support to the State. I do not say this because I am an Episcopalian, for I am not; but to enforce the necessity of unanimity in the prevailing religion of the State; or, of making it *National in its form, tendency, and operation;* since that may be considered orthodox, which has the most adherents, who are made so by birth, education, or accident; as each sect pretends, from Scripture, to derive proof to its system. It is the force of circumstances we have been speaking of, which has produced the established religion of England—the choice of its people, and which is necessary to its peace—the security of the Government, and the strength of the nation.

"What a beneficial influence would it have on publick sentiment and feeling, if the index of its character should be distinguished by a more *national costume*, which would be solemn and imposing, and such as would secure to the sacerdotal character that reverence which is due to it. The emblems of worship, properly prepared and arranged, and approved of by a majority of the nation, might be made to correspond with it in other respects. Will it be believed, that thus qualified, any of the leading sects of this country would repel the *sanction of the government* if offered to them? Are the professors of worship in England to be, and would those in this country, preferring a different mode, be consigned to perdition for differing from each other?

"From what has been said we may rationally conclude, that a zealous co-operation among the most respectable religious sects in our country, is tending to a consolidation, in the principles, doctrines, and forms of worship, so desirable to every true Christian, and which may eventually bring about a Conventional arrangement as to a settled form. These anticipations may be further realized, in securing from Congress an appropriation of a portion of the publick lands, to a limited, and yet sufficient number of the Clergy, and for a well defined course of Education. This is prospective, and those who are fastidious about it, may gradually sacrifice their prejudices and scruples, which will be likely to be dissipated by the light of religious knowledge, on the altar of harmony and concord."

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

AMICUS versus EDITOR, No. 4.

Mr. Editor:—Your review of my third Epistle I have noticed, and I perceive as I anticipated (if I be competent to judge discreetly) that some of those apparent differences of opinion which exist between us, consist more in name than nature. But notwithstanding we agree in some abstract principles, yet there seems to be a division in our deductions, and also in our conceptions of other things. I have expressed my views concerning some subjects and have given some of my reasons for embracing these opinions. You have endeavoured to show their fallacy, and to rear an edifice more permanent by establishing another system of ethicks, giving the reasons for imbibing such ideas. I have examined by analysis their properties, and the result of our investigations are before each other and before the publick, therefore as the size of your publication will scarcely suffer us to enter into detail—as we speak as unto wise men who will judiciously judge of the propriety of our argumentations, perhaps it will be well for us to follow out each others concatenation of reasoning (leaving it for the residue to do likewise) in all their different bearings, compare the same with our own schemes, and if we be capable of perceiving the truth (as you would have us believe) from that determine which is the most congruous, philosophical and logical.

As you appear to feel disposed to withdraw from the field of action for the present and to suspend our controversial disputation concerning the doctrine of *imputed righteousness*, in order to preserve a *fire* until some future period, when probably you expect it will be salutary in doing greater execution than at this juncture, I shall make no objections to waiting your time, choosing rather to break a lance with the Knight who, being prepared for the conflict, boldly and bravely, defends himself, than one who is destitute of armour and flies before the shaft crying for quarters, or one that is compelled reluctantly to wield his sword against his antagonist.

Although several of your paragraphs vary from what I conceive to be pure unadulterated

truth, yet as the subjects therein contained have been partially discussed, I would pass over your review without comment leaving it for your readers to judge of its merits and turn my attention to some other *subject* which demands observation and inspection, were it not for your misapprehension of my logick. While reasoning, you will discover that I am not habituated to draw conclusions without premises, save in laying down principles that are self-evident truths, for I would not beg the question at issue, by taking certain positions, which remain to be proved. I would therefore ap prise you that my asseverations are generally the product of enquiry or the result of a logical induction.

You enquire "how I know the means of holiness do not extend beyond this life?" I answer. This allegation was not made because it is a conspicuous article of my faith, but because it was a natural inference drawn from certain premises which you had laid down as fundamental principles, and was used by way of argument to show the absurdity of your scheme, though I do not deny the truth of the proposition. Now observe you remark in your Review No. 1, that "Christ's life, preaching, suffering, death and resurrection when believed is calculated to produce righteousness in us, and that faith is the moving cause of our justi fication because it is a means and some say the only means of producing moral goodness."—Now if I understand your sentiments you believe that the salvation obtained through our Lord Jesus Christ consists in a deliverance from every evil propensity and the dark environs of sin with all its deleterious effects, which is synonymous with possessing a heart void of moral depravity and a disposition inclined to moral goodness. But what will affect this salvation? You say a belief in Christ's life, preaching, suffering, death and resurrection. I ask does faith or belief extend beyond the shores of mortality! Will not there be on the glorious morning of the resurrection a sudden transition from faith to reality? But further, You observe in a manner as yielding concession to the proposition, that some say the ONLY means of justification consists in faith, for faith produces moral goodness, or in other words, (that there may, be no opportunity for sophistical remarks,) the ONLY means of producing moral goodness, which we shall see are synonymous in your chain of reasoning. Let this logick be reduced to order and see what will be the result. Without holiness or moral goodness none can be justified, for God will pronounce none just until they are just. Justification is necessary to salvation; therefore without holiness no man can be saved. Faith is the ONLY means of producing moral goodness; hence without faith none can become good nor enter into rest. Faith, being the "substance of things not seen and the evidence of things hoped for," cannot extend beyond this life.—Therefore the means of producing moral goodness, or the means of holiness must be confined and limited to earth. Now inasmuch as all do not have faith, "the moving cause of our justification"—as all do not become holy through the means adopted, how can all become just? These are and were my conclusions drawn from your premises. *See my quotation in the 3d Letter.* And if you now ask how I know the means of holiness are limited to this life? The answer is before you, because it agrees with your own allegations and acknowledgements, which I do not at present say are illogical. You will have the goodness to redeem your pledge.

But in order to liberate yourself from this dilemma and maintain your favourite tenet, after having stated positively and unequivocally, that you believed that faith was a "means and as some say, (virtually giving your assent) the *only* means of producing moral goodness, you affirm it to be your opinion that the means of holiness extend beyond this sublunary world. But how will ye reconcile this declaration with the observations? Will ye say that faith is employed in another world to bring souls to God? This will remain for you to prove. But since you have given some reasons for believing the means of salvation or deliverance from sin do reach beyond this existence it may be proper to notice some of the most prominent. You ask, "will God ever place his own offspring beyond the reach of holiness?" This will be attended to when you have proved that "faith the ONLY means of producing" holiness extend into another world, or when you have made it appear obvious that other means are employed. You ask further, "Will an infinitely good God place those he has commanded to be righteous in a situation where they must eternally remain unrighteous." The strength of the argument contained in this interrogation, I apprehend is this. Would a God consistently good command his intelligent offspring to be holy and perfect, and then situate them where they can never obey the requirement? This apparent inconsistency may be readily obviated by considering, 1st. That the law is only binding on a man while he liveth. 2d. That God will not propel them to be holy by changing his moral government from persuasive to compulsive. 3d. That the creature will have no disposition to assimilate to the moral perfections of the Deity. You enquire again, "Will he who delights in goodness ever prevent his own offspring from growing better?" To this question the above considerations are applicable, for by them we perceive that God will not prevent his children, from making improvements in their moral condition as well as in the expansion of the intellect and cultivation of the mind, neither does it argue that God will enforce them to grow wiser and better,—to progress in knowledge—or live

godly. But you enquire, "Who dare say Jesus may not be as efficient to save after death as before?" This question may as well be discussed and answered, when you have redeemed your pledge, showing when and how, by whom and by what means all are made holy.

You say, although "there is no other name given *under heaven* whereby we can be saved but the name of Jesus Christ" "yet there may be other names in eternity, for *under heaven* merely signifies the earth, during life". O, sophistry where is thy blush! Do ye not perceive you confine the blessings of the Dear Redeemer to this transitory life?—Are ye not aware of divesting him of his glory and honour, by limiting his efficiency and power to things of time? Foreseeing what would be the result of such speculations, in order to maintain one prime article of your faith (viz) that all will be saved and made holy you have resorted to this stratagem; "I dare not say God has but one set of means for our salvation." But why not? Perhaps it is because you would be reduced to this alternative, either to deny that all will become holy, or to yield up your hope of salvation. But do you expect to be made holy and happy through the instrumentality of any other mediator save the Lord's Christ? O, how vain must be that hope of salvation which rests on the visionary conception that there are other names in eternity, by which man can be redeemed, when there is not so much as an intimation of their appointment in all the revelation of heaven! "But you say Christ's doctrine is the doctrine of life and immortality." I ask by whom and by what means are mankind brought to the possession of life and immortality! Are all, who become immortal, redeemed from sin and made holy as soon as they obtain the inheritance? Do none become immortal before they are cleansed from all moral polution and moral evil? Answers to these questions will pave the way to the determination of Christ's efficiency of which you speak.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

DEAR SIR:—I have carefully perused your review of my letter, and admire the ingenuity you have displayed. Every man should have the right to interpret his own language and sentiments. But without your answer to me your *real* sentiments would have been concealed to my understanding, and I believe, to the comprehension of many of your readers. This being the case, no evil I apprehend, can arise from our correspondence, but rather a good, as it has served to develope your meaning, where I think a further explanation was absolutely necessary. I regret the apparent bitterness in parts of your reply, but I can reciprocate all the friendship you have expressed towards me in your first paragraph. Your answer is, for the most part satisfactory, at least so far as to answer every important object. I am satisfied you believe in the existence of God, as revealed in the scriptures, and in the Gospel of Christ. This is enough. But I must say to you, dear sir, *I was not satisfied of this when I wrote.* And I think you will admit, that, without the *key* furnished in your notice of my objections, many parts of your Essays are ambiguous. Your personal reflections I will say nothing about—I will say nothing about your communication as it respects your faith, but what I have said.

I admit, that your former sentiments furnish nothing against your present belief, nor did I make the statement for that purpose, but because, to me, at the time, they bore a strong resemblance to each other: and if they were really so, I was resolved to know the worst of it and not mince matters. But I probably should never have known any thing about your former entiments if you had not told me yourself. But perhaps you had forgotten, that you gave me the information, during our absence together to the town of M. last fall to attend a funeral, in answer to my saying, I could not pursuade myself, that there ever was an Atheist who was capable of contemplating the wonders of nature and of providence. But let that go.

I have always thought well of your talents. But your manner of expressing your ideas manifests so little respect for the subjects upon which you write, however sacred, that I believe your labours as an editor, should you continue the same course, will never feast the mind of the devout Christian, nor convince a single sceptick of the truth of Christianity. I feel a glow of friendship towards you and the cause in which you profess to be engaged, in the freedom I have used respecting the manner of your expression. And I shall hope, that you will drop that apparent indifference to the sensibilities of others, till I see how you treat this suggestion of mine.

I am sorry to see your insinuation, that "I must suppose the spirit by which the apostles were inspired was the "holy doctrine of Christ." It would have been more becoming the philosopher and the Christian to have stated the case as it was, as you probably had the means, and must have known if you had, that you misrepresented me. In the original article to which you allude, Adv. Vol. 5. p. 58, I have said—"For undoubtedly the 'holy spirit' *mentioned in the text* (Matt. xii. 31, 32) is the same as the spirit (or doctrine) of God, 1 John iv. 1, 2." And in my notice of A's objections, p. 98, I observed: "I have said in my Exposition, that the word spirit *in the text* (i. e. the same text) signifies doctrine. *By this I did not mean to be understood, that the word has the same meaning in every instance where it occurs, for the case is plainly otherwise.*" I even devoted a paragraph to show my meaning and the distinction I had made, all of which you might have explained.

For the present I have done. I approve of your article so far as I felt interested and sought information. Let the rest pass.

Yours, &c. W. I. REESE.

The following letter may be read as a matter of curiosity, and perhaps should be handed down to posterity that future generations may learn how wise, how far advanced in knowledge was a Presbyterian Theological Seminary in the 19th century. We suppress the names, for we cannot find it in our heart to bestow as much popularity upon the writer as he would necessarily receive from having his name mentioned as the author of so splendid a production, a production which would shame a boy ten years old. We shall attempt no answer, we will not enter the lists with an ideot or with one who is rescued from contempt by the utter insignificance of his thoughts. Alas for the Auburn Seminary! Say ye students is this a fair sample of your ability? ED.

ARCADIA, July 25th, 1829.

Brother Brownson, Sir: I send you a communication sent from the Theological Seminary in your village, to a young man in this vicinity, some time last summer. The young man to whom it was sent, was directly after taken sick, and has not been able to attend to the correspondence. I saw the letter a few days since, and requested a copy with the privilege of sending it you. Whether it has passed the ordeal of inspection by the Professors or not, so as to draw the $20, does not appear from any certificates attending it.

I therefore send it to you to make what use of it you may think proper. If you dare enter the field with such a champion, I shall expect to hear from it. The chief merit I am able to discover in this production is that it came from the Theological Seminary.

Yours, &c. SAM'L A. SKEEL.

Auburn Theological Seminary,
July 31st, 1828.

SIR—While at your house you and I had a little conversation about Bible doctrines, and differed from each other as much as the inhabitants of heaven differ from those of hell. I asked you your opinion concerning the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, but did not obtain it. I now ask it of you and particularly of the 1st, 2d, 3d, 10th and 14th verses. The universalist believes all are happy, that there is no hell after death. Now sir, I will be a universalist three or four minutes, this is long enough, there is no hell and all mankind from Adam to the present time who have died are now in heaven with God, and are happy and will forever remain so. There never was such a person as Christ, and therefore I do not believe he or any other person ever died to save mankind—talk about being saved it is nonsense. Here let me say that my universalist brethren are inconsistent with themselves.—Now I will go the whole length and be a universalist indeed—and I want all my brethren consistent with the doctrine of universal salvation, depend upon it sir, we shall loose some in spite of our teeth, some will go to hell (universal salvation notwithstanding.) If we hold to the doctrine that Christ died to save us.—Now I say there is no hell—and this is a doctrine held by all my brethren, now I ask what does Christ save us from? my universalist brethren say that Christ died to save us; they say also that there is no hell, I leave this peculiar doctrine for you to digest. And now after being a strong universalist three or four minutes, I declare to you that I will no longer hold to this doctrine, and I will give you my reasons—it is because this doctrine cannot be sustained by the Bible; and because it suits the carnal mind, also because it is repugnant to the feelings of every Christian, these reasons are sufficient. I do hope sir that you will investigate this subject and write to me soon. Either you or myself are in an errour, and this errour is very great. Now, you say I am wrong, and I say you are wrong, and therefore let us know who is in the wrong way. I am willing to exchange a few letters with you on those doctrines, and I do most effectionately invite a correspondence. I know sir that I am small, but I am willing to stand alone and combat you and all the universalists this side the eternal world. If you are willing to hold a correspondence with me, I invite all the help you can obtain, and small as I am I will stand against them all.

We insert the following not because we wish to injure the reputation of one of the individuals named, nor do we it because some words have heretofore passed between brother Fisk and ourselves, but merely to convince our brethren we have a sectarian spirit in our ranks, and that we must expel it if we hope for prosperity to our common cause. We must purge out the old leaven, we must even anticipate the spirit of the new era about to commence.—ED.

Extract of a Letter dated New-York, August 1st, 1829.

"A singular occurrence has taken place here in relation to a contemplated correspondence with different parts of Europe and America, in order to obtain a more general knowledge of the progress of liberal principles. This grew particularly out of the circumstance of the recent publication of Mr. Dwight's Letters from Germany. Pursuant to public notice, a meeting was held, when a committee of *twenty-one persons* were appointed to draft resolutions, &c. expressive of our gratitude at the good news of the progress of "liberal christianity" in Germany and elsewhere. At this second meeting these resolutions were reported and adopted, and the Rev. B. Bates was appointed to deliver an address the *fourth of July*, on the occasion. At a subsequent meeting it was concluded to print

a pamphlet consisting of 32 pages, containing the resolutions, address, extracts from Dwight's Letters, and such other matters as should be thought important. And agreeably to one of the resolutions, a committee of foreign and domestick correspondence was appointed, consisting of *nine* persons. Mr. Thomas, publisher of the Gospel Herald, undertook to print 2000 copies of the Address, &c. of 32 pages each, for $60, a considerable portion of which was subscribed for at the time by the members of the corresponding committee; and Mr. R. Canfield, and Mr. T. Bussing, were appointed a committee with him to see the execution of the work. Mr. Thomas, however, was taken sick, and Mr. Bussing not being able to attend to it, the whole was given up to Mr. Canfield. Sixteen pages had gone to press, and six others were in type, and every thing going on smoothly, when Mr. Fisk returned from Philadelphia, and finding Mr. Kneeland's name on the corresponding committee, and also some of the manuscript designed to complete the work was from his pen, it was determined to exclude such obnoxious matter. In the mean time, Mr. Thomas starts for the Springs, for the benefit of his health, when Mr. Fisk, claiming to represent both Mr. Thomas and Mr. Bussing, two of the publishing committee, thus constituted himself *dictator!* Of course Mr. Canfield could do nothing further in the case. The pamphlet was worked off with 20 pages only, instead of 32, excluding two pages already in type, and thereby excluding the obnoxious *name*, together with all the obnoxious *matter!* But, by so doing, the names of the whole committee were excluded; nor does it appear from the pamphlet that such a committee had ever been appointed. The committee, however, will not be thus imposed upon. They have resolved to reject the pamphlet, and have nothing to do with it; and will advertise the publick that it is unauthorized. Whether they will publish another, such as they intended that to have been, and expose all these circumstances to view, or whether they will dissolve, and take no farther notice of the matter, yet remains to be decided upon. The committee will meet this evening. Comment is unnecessary."

Extract of a letter dated Ohio, July 30, 1829.

"DEAR SIR—I have attended to the controversy between yourself and Mr. Reese, and cannot but lament that we should be forever splitting straws while the enemies of every species of freedom are inventing improvements on the Spanish Inquisition, with such a smile as sat on the countenance of Lucifer when mankind fell. Why is it that the moment our liberals undertake to pull down the orthodox iron bedstead, they must set up their own? Like Rome are we to be freed from Pompey's chains merely to substitute Caesar's? Or, must Issachar forever crouch between two burdens?—Suppose you do not believe in the divine origin of the scriptures, is that Atheism? Or, suppose you deny the immortality of the soul, is that a reason why God could not exist?

Mr. Reese (whose talents I respect,) admits "that no man can help, and should not be blamed, for his honest sentiments, he has nevertheless, fallen into the same course of invective with our exclusively righteous folks, in order to frighten people, by applying the terms infidel, deist, atheist, to sentiments which have no more connection with those principles, than we have with Mr. Symes' subterranean world; and even if they had, according to his own admisssion, no blame could attach. While every thing valuable in this world is at stake, to quarrel among ourselves because we are not all of one height or complexion, is absurd in the extreme; and I am not one of those who believe with the Aborigines of our country, that if we let the rattlesnake alone he will therefore let us alone. I see more cause for despondency in our own narrow notions and disunion, than in all the efforts of orthodoxy.

I have just perused a pamphlet published at Utica, entitled "The logick and law of Col. Johnson's report to the Senate, on Sabbath mails," which no doubt you have seen, and if so you have perceived that satan is to be again loosed for a time.—Would it not be well to take measures to put the publick on their guard by suitable notices, not only in our *infidel* pamphlets, but also in all our gazettes, whose editors have the temerity to be honest? If our opponents are to monopolize all the policy of this world and add it to that of the lower regions, we are lost; but, if we fall, let us die in the last ditch. *Respectfully yours, &c.*

We approve of the suggestions of this letter. Something must be done. The orthodox will not yield to a slight repulse. They were checked by the Report of the Committee in Senate, but they will make a more vigourous attack the ensuing campaign, and woe to our country if they succeed. There is a principle involved in their measures—a principle dear to every heart, and one which should arouse every American to action. We decided the great question of liberty and independence, but we must decide it again. The people must arise in their majesty and say, we will be politically and mentally free, or the victories of our Revolution will become our shame.

We have not seen the pamphlet above alluded to.

EDITOR.

RELIGION.

And what is Religion? Is a question which deeply interests every honest enquirer after truth. The most ancient records of which we are in possession, inform us, man has ever been equally anxious to answer this momentous question. Nations, to solve it, have placed themselves in battle array,—man has contend-

ed with man, brother spilled the blood of brother, and yet it remains unanswered.

Who can travel over the historick pages of antiquity, and not feel an honest indignation at the cruelties, blood-shed, and religious persecutions, which have ever blinded the deluded votaries of Faith. Mark the blinded and deluded followers of Mahomet, flocking around the crescent, and fondly dreaming, that under this, the banner of their prophet, all shall be well;—worshiping their sacred book, the Koran, in which there is "no falsehood." But, does *ecclesiastical history* present us a picture more pleasing? Have the followers of "the meek and lowly Jesus," when clothed in power, been more consistent, or more humane in their practice? Would to heaven I could answer in the affirmative! But, ever since christianity obtained the support of the secular arm, in the fourth century, by the murderous Constantine, it has been one continued scene of havock and blood. Christians have flocked to the standard of the Cross, with as much superstitious zeal and blind devotion, as has ever been manifested by the ignorant and infatuated worshippers of the Pagan deities. They have vainly imagined inscribed on their standard, "*in this conquer*," regardless of the means used, or the justness of their cause. They, too, have ignorantly worshipped a book, imagined to contain sentiments which consign the greater part of the human race to an endless hell. The Hindoo has his sacred books and his deceiving priesthood. And so of all others. Were we to examine, in detail, the different systems presented to man—presented with all the solemnity of the eternal world, accompanied with the anathemas of the priest, in case of our refusal, what a motly group should we behold, all equally claiming our unhesitating belief!

I have long since learned to judge of the utility of a Religion, by the happiness or misery it produces to our race. Is this correct or is it not? Shall I answer according to the dictates of reason? Or shall I bow to the priest and place implicit confidence in his pretended message from God? Reason and common sense unitedly concur in answering in the negative. Go, ask the priest, what constitutes Religion? And what must be the state of Society, in order, to be entitled to the *endearing* appellation, Religious? His answer will be in the following,—"Have they a professedly Orthodox Preacher? Do they liberally support him? Are they constant in their attendance on Church? Have they Sunday Schools? Missionary, Tract, and Bible societies?" And I may add, are all inquisitive as to the faith of others? Do they manifest a laudable zeal in proselyting others to their peculiar faith, regardless of reforming the vices of their victim? If you can answer in the affirmative, to these and the like questions, he will praise you "to the skies," extoll the happy state of that "people, whose God is the Lord of heaven and of earth." Reader, do you assent to the truth of what I assert. If so, does your heart not sicken within you, to think of "the foolishness of man." Think ye, all these mighty exertions are made with a view to benefit our race? Or are they to promote the ascendancy of "the few over the many?" Or to allure the mind with learning and keep it forever destitute of *knowledge*? Have not the priesthood, in all ages, been the bane of human happiness, by inculcating a sectarian spirit? Are they not anxiously seeking for "the wisdom of this world?" Beware! "for the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." 1 Cor. iii. 19.

But, our question is, what is religion? We have seen by the cursory view we have taken, it consists not in *profession*; for if it does, no religion, with which we are acquainted, can be beneficial to man. Still the question is easily answered. That course which most effectually promotes the happiness of the human race, or which produces the greatest amount of enjoyment to the whole, I call a religious course. To ascertain what will constitute me a religious man, I have only to ask, how shall I promote my own happiness and the happiness of my brethren? Revelation and nature inform me, God loves every son and daughter of Adam. To serve him, I have only to promote the happiness of his children. Here is a wide field of enquiry. Here fearlessly enquire, by what means the condition of man may be improved; pursue the course free enquiry points out, and fear not the result. Rest assured that he who governs the world is no "respecter of persons; but in every nation he who feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted." Acts x. 34, 35. Jesus, the Saviour of men, summed up our duty in these few words, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Matt. xx. 37, 39. Here is no unmeaning ceremonies; no parade of devotion; no mysterious creeds, nor incoherent dogmas, the more revered as they are the less understood. All is plain and easy to be comprehended. Nature points out the path we are to follow, let us pursue it. Revelation has been dressed in mystery by a designing priest-hood long enough. Long enough, have the plain and simple doctrines, taught by Jesus of Nazareth, been obscured by "the wisdom" of designing men. Let us arise, and in the mighty strength of our intellectual powers, declare ourselves mentally free. Let us follow the precepts of our Leader, acknowledge no man master, "for one is our father, even he that is in heaven, and all we are brethren." Let us have no organized priest-hood of whatever name or sect. Let our Teachers be such, as are acquainted with man and his wants,

such as know more of earth and less of heaven. Let us be virtuous *now*, and we need not fear the destinies of futurity. Let us remember, that "man's religion is vain," who fondly dreams of another world to the neglect of this. That "religion which is pure and unefiled before our God and Father, is this, to visit the orphans and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world."

PHILANTHROPE.

QUESTIONS.

MR. EDITOR,—Do you consider liberty of opinion is to be unlimited? Do you think a man can be a Deist or an Atheist, and be a good man? Do you hold that man has any *right* to doubt the truth of Divine revelation or the existence of a God? Please to answer these queries, and oblige Yours, ZENO.

To each of the above questions we say Yes. We know not where to fix the limits of the liberty of opinion. And some of the best men we have ever known have been Deists and Atheists. Divine Revelation and the existence of God are matters of faith and no man is obliged to believe without evidence, if he has evidence he cannot help believing. A man has a perfect right to doubt the truth of any statement until it is proved true, or he has evidence enough to convince him.

We learn from the papers, that Mrs. Royal of "Black Book" fame, has been convicted of being a common scold. We think the court and jury must have been wedded to termagants, and therefore took this publick opportunity to exhibit that disapprobation of *scolds* which they dared not do *at home*.

Our brother of the "Eastern Chronicle," Maine, has a great propensity to punning. It was a saying of Dr. Johnson, that "he who would make a pun would pick a pocket." Johnson was undoubtedly wrong, but the practice ought to be left to buffoons. A grave editor of a religious newspaper seems destitute of gravity, when he writes like the following: 'Hon. Joel Doolittle has been nominated as candidate for Governour of Vermont, If elected we hope he will *Doo-little* with *craft*-iness.'

EXISTENCE OF GOD.

We have been told *nature* teaches the existence of God. This is undoubtedly correct, unless by the term GOD you understand a being corresponding to the Jehovah of the Bible. This God, according to the scriptural definition of the term, can be learned only from revelation. No man, in his senses, can doubt the existence of some great vivifying Power whose operations produce wisdom or intelligence. When the writer of this said he did not learn the existence of God from nature, he meant nothing more than that God as represented by revelation, can be only learned from revlation.

The way to be a great Sermonizer.—Copy the whole sermon, with the exception of a few words, from one or two authors of some repute, and when you print give credit for one or two paragraphs, and make no marks by which the unlearned can tell how much is your own, or how much is *borrowed*. This recipe is seldom known to fail of procuring applause from the ignorant, and for others, their applause or their approbation should not be regarded by a preacher.

We are indebted to the Free Enquirer for the excellent Address which appears in this number of our paper. And though some may think the address is not very properly arranged with "The Preacher," we have only to add we wish we could always have a discourse equally valuable to place under that head. Mr. Owen, we believe, is a son of Robert Owen, the great Philanthropist of New Lanark and of New Harmony.

The Genesee Association of Universalists will assemble at Le Roy Genesee Co., on the fourth Wednesday and following Thursday, in September ensuing.

The Cayuga Association of Universalists will meet at Auburn, Cayuga Co. on the first Wednesday and following Thursday in October next. It is hoped there will be a full attendance. Our Societies will recollect to send delegates, and our brother preachers from other associations are respectfully invited to attend.

O. A. BROWNSON, *Clerk.*

DIED.—In Fleming, Cayuga county, N. Y. on the 5th inst., Mrs. Sarah Gregory, relict of Mr. Noah Gregory, aged 73 years. Mrs. Gregory was a firm believer in the salvation of all men. She died full in this faith rejoicing in the unbounded goodness of God as her husband did before her.—*Communicated.*

In Rochester, N. Y. on the 16th of July, Mr. Bela Tracy, in the 69th year of his age.

His illness was of short duration; only six days confinement, although he lost his reason on the first day of his confinement to his house. I believe it will be readily granted by all his acquaintance that he died full in the Abrahamick faith; for which he had been a strong advocate for nearly forty years. It is doing no more than justice to his remains to say he was an affectionate husband, and exemplary father and a devout Christian. He ever considered God's boundless and ever during mercy; the only proper basis of his hope of a resurrection to life and immortality. Such is the confidence and such the consolation resulting from "the faith once delivered to the saints."—*Com.*

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday. by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance. to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1829. [NO. 18.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

BY SAMUEL BRIMBLECOM.

"*And the borders went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom, unto the south side of the Jebusite—the same is Jerusalem.*"—Joshua, xv. 8.

Scripture history and geography are interesting and important. The study of them serves to disentangle knotty questions in theology, which are always numerous in proportion as men are ignorant. The valley of the son of Hinnom mentioned in the text as one of the boundaries of the tribe of Judah, and lying on the south side of Jerusalem, Christians have mistaken, so far as it is mentioned in the New Testament, for a place of torment called hell in a future state of existence.

I propose, first, to give a concise history of this valley; and secondly, to shew the unsubstantial foundation on which the doctrine of a local hell in a future state of existence rests.

1. I propose to give a history of the valley of Hinnom. The text is the first passage in the Holy Scriptures where I find this place mentioned. Here it is mentioned as one of the landmarks or boundaries of the tribe of Judah. It is mentioned in the same manner that other undistinguished places are mentioned, with no allusion whatever to the peculiar circumstances which afterwards gave it so undesirable a notoriety. It is mentioned as the farm or lot of one man, called the "son of Hinnom;" a circumstance which leads us to presume that its extent was not great. We are further told, that the boundary of Judah, "went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom, unto the south side of the Jebusite—the same is Jerusalem." We learn from this that the valley of the son of Hinnom lay south, or so as to conduct to the south side of the possession of another person called the Jebusite. That person, it appears, owned the spot on which Jerusalem was built, or the south part of Jerusalem; for, it is immediately added "the same is Jerusalem"—"unto the south side of the Jebusite the same is Jerusalem." Geographers tell us that this valley lays south of the city, or on the south and west of mount Sion, and was very deep so that the city was inaccessible in that part. This fact is connected with the most affecting and melancholy part of its history. Carpenter's Geography, pp. 45 and 52.

The valley of Hinnom was first rendered odious by the unlawful idolatries practised there. The ceremonies performed in this valley under the garb of religion, are among the most shocking which the religious principle in man, powerful as it is, has ever led him to perform. We are informed that in this place the people were accustomed to burn their children of *both sexes* in honour of a false God called Molock; that they did this in opposition to an express command; and that when that excellent king, Josiah, came upon the throne, this was one of the great and leading abuses, which it became his duty, as it was his honour to correct. Lev. xx. 2—5, and 2 Kings, xxiii. 10.

We read in the 2d book of Kings that Josiah "defiled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech." These words teach, not only that people sacrificed their children, but did so without distinction of sex; that the valley of Hinnom, in whole or in part, was also called Topheth, and that King Josiah made an attempt, which we learn was successful, to destroy the sacredness of Topheth and render it obnoxious. The name Topheth was probably derived from the Hebrew word Toph, which signifies a drum, because that instrument was made use of to drown the cries of the helpless infants, which were there cruelly, though superstitiously destroyed. But it may have been derived from a word relating to the execrable idolatries practised there, without particular reference to the noise of the drum.

In every period of the world, multitudes have consoled themselves with absurd rites, or empty ceremonies, or cruel sacrifices, or unprofitable experiences, and have let go the great essentials of religion, *love and mercy*. It may be presumed by some, that the cruel ceremony of sacrificing infants must have been confined to the most ignorant of the people; that it could never have been countenanced by kings and courts, (if there was any thing which deserved the name,) but that the higher classes in society, must have looked upon it with merited contempt and abhorrence. How are we disappointed to learn that even the influence of the throne was given to this extravagance of religious iniquity—that the humbler classes had not even the example of the exalted to guide them rightly, nor the influence of their silent contempt to exert its salutary restraint. The Chronicles have preserved the remembrance of

the impious conduct of unprincipled Ahaz. It is distinctly recorded, not only that he "burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom," but that he "burnt his children in the fire, after the abominations of the heathen whom the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel." Of king Manassas it is recorded, among numerous abominable and irreligious practices, that "he caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom." Under such influence as we might suppose, this monstrous impiety became overwhelming, and like a rushing flood drew every thing into its vortex. We are told, that "they, their kings, their princes, their priests and their prophets, and the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem," among other abominations, "built the high places of Baal, which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire unto Molech." 2 Chron. xxviii. 3, and xxxiii. 6. Jer. xxxii. 32—35.

Josiah "defiled Topheth." Geographers tell us that "when Josiah had recalled the Jews to the worship of the true God, the valley of Hinnom was made the receptacle for the filth of the city, for the bones and carcases of animals, and even for the bodies of criminals, who had been executed;" and that, "to consume these impure substances, fires were kept continually burning, and on the putrid matter worms were always feeding." Carpenter's Geography, p. 53.

On two accounts, therefore, the valley of Hinnom, once pure, was destined to become odious to the Jewish people; and on both accounts it would convey to their minds a lively sense of misery and wretchedness. To be cast there, would be the most dreaded end that could befall them. Yet of such a termination of their follies they were abundantly warned.

Jeremiah twice declares, that whereas they have burned their infants there, the day will come, when "it shall no more be called Tophet, or the valley of the son of Hinnom, but *the valley of slaughter;* for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no place, and the carcases of this people shall be meat for the fowls of heaven and for the beasts of the earth, and none shall fray them away." Jer. vii. 32, and xix. 6.

This prophecy was literally accomplished in respect to immense multitudes. It is probable that when the Roman army besieged Jerusalem, many of the Jewish nations might have flocked into the city, partly to defend the city and partly to be defended themselves. We are told by the historian Josephus, that at the siege the people died in great numbers, and that six hundred thousand were suffered to lie unburied.—So that ample opportunity was furnished to the fowls of the air and the beasts of the earth to prey upon them. Such was the final catastrophe by which this ill-fated spot has become notorious. This event took place in thirty-seven years after the crucifixion of our Lord. Josephus, vol. VI. book V. chap. xiii. 7, and chap. xii. 3.

I have entered into these particulars of the history and geography of the valley of Hinnom to enable my hearers to judge of the meaning of those passages of the New Testament in which it is mentioned. Before I commence a recital of those passages I wish to observe, that the Hebrew words which mean the valley of Hinnom, are "Ge-hinnom" and that the Greek word "Gehenna" is a compound of those two words united in one, without a change of meaning. This word, "Gehenna," is now commonly used in speaking, in writing and on maps, as the name of that place. I wish, therefore, to be understood as meaning one and the same place whether I use the Hebrew words "Gehinnom," or the Greek word "Gehenna," or the English words "Valley of Hinnom."

My object in adducing those passages in the New Testament where the valley of Hinnom is mentioned, is, to show,

2dly. That the doctrine of a local hell in a future state of existence rests on an unsubstantial foundation; and that the valley of Hinnom is wrongly translated by the word hell.

Our Lord alludes to this valley twice in one discourse in which he rebuked the Scribes and Pharisees. It is remarkable that on no other occasion did he allude to it in addressing unbelievers. The discourse is recorded in the 23d chap. of Matt. He says, first, verse 15th, "Wo unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of the valley of Hinnom than yourselves." I presume all my hearers will understand the phrase "child of the valley of Hinnom" as meaning a very odious and really corrupt person; or one fitted for destruction according to the prophecy and threatening of the Old Testament. We must all be sensible that the phrase, "child of hell," which we read in English Testaments ought not to mean any thing different from "child of the valley of Hinnom." The other allusion to this valley, contained in the same discourse and recorded in the same chapter, is found in the 33d verse. "Fill ye up the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of the valley of Hinnom?" By the damnation of the valley of Hinnom we shall readily understand the punishment, sentence or condemnation of being cast out to suffer the ruin foretold. The use of the word "hell" in the English Testament, however it may blind many to the sense of those passages, evidently cannot alter the real meaning. These are the only passages in the New Testament in which the valley of Hinnom is mentioned as a place of punishment in addressing the unconverted.

I will now cite those passages in which the

valley of Hinnom is mentioned *nine times* by our Lord when addressing disciples; in all of which the meaning is obscured in the English Testament by the use of the word "hell" instead of the valley of Hinnom.

Matt. v. 22. "I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the Judgement; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council, but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of the valley of Hinnom fire." It is probable that we all essentially agree in the meaning of this language. Who supposes that a Jew could understand our Lord as referring to any other place, than that of which I have given the history? All the misunderstanding which there is on the subject, is owing to the omission of the real name of the place, and using the word "hell" in its stead.

In the same discourse and chapter, Matt. v. 29, 30, our Lord, teaching to resist corrupt passions and inclinations, says, "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into the valley of Hinnom." The perfect agreement of the brief argument here presented, with the prophecies of the Old Testament, together with the clear ideas offered to the mind, so far as we are possessed of a knowledge of the Old Testament, affect us with pleasure. We feel that there is nothing gained but the true meaning lost, by the use of the word 'hell' in this passage in our English New Testament. The whole *body* might be cast into the valley of Hinnom; but, how could the *body* be cast into hell as it is commonly understood? All can understsnd that it was better for the disciples to be faithful and virtuous than to be cast out to be a prey for the fowls of the air and the beasts of the earth.

A similar passage is found in Matt. xviii. 8, 9. "Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off and cast them from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into the valley of Hinnom fire."

A third similar passage is found in Mark ix. 43—49. "And if thy hand offend thee cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into the valley of Hinnom, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet, to be cast into the valley of Hinnom, into the fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes, to be cast into the valley of Hinnom fire, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

The doctrine of these passages is perfectly easy to be understood so far as this; that it was better for the persons addressed to be obedient to God, and truly pious, than to be cast into the valley of Hinnom fire, or to be exposed there to the corroding worm.

The word "everlasting," and the mention of a fire that shall not be quenched, and of a worm that dieth not, are all applied to the valley of Hinnom, and perfectly accord with the history of that place, the prophecies of the Old Testament respecting it, and the language of the Old Testament writers. I say the language of the Old Testament writers. The closing words of Isaiah, speaking of then future worshippers of the Lord, are these, "They shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." It is not improbable that the language of our Lord was founded on this language of Isaiah. The language of Isaiah, although it speaks of a worm that never dies, and a fire not to be quenched, is strictly confined in its application to this world. This distinctly appears from the mention of the carcasses of the transgressors exposed unburied to corruption and destruetion. We are not told that either the carcases, or the worm, or the fire, belong to a spiritual state of existence beyond the grave. But we are told that the carcases of these miserable men should be for an abhorring unto all *flesh, not all spirits*. So that every particular of the language applies to this world, and accords perfectly with the information we have respecting the valley of Hinnom, and the actual exposure of six hundred thousand dead bodies at the siege of Jerusalem. But, without referring to Isaiah, our Lord's words fix the spot where the impious might be exposed to the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched, or the everlasting fire. He says expressly and repeatedly, the valley of Hinnom, the valley of Hinnom. So that we know no other way to understand the everlasting fire, and the undying worm, but as alluding to fires always kept burning there, and to the filth and carcases of animals on which worms were always feeding in that place.

The only remaining instances of the mention of the valley of Hinnom by our Lord, are the two following:—Matt. x. 28. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in the valley of Hinnom." Luke xii. 45. "I say unto you my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do: but I forewarn you whom ye shall

fear: fear him, who, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into the valley of Hinnom."

On these passages I offer one remark. The destruction of the bodies of a large number of their citizens in the valley of Hinnom, by fire, and worms, and beasts, and birds, would not have been allowed under any ordinary circumstances. Friendship, fellow feeling, respect for the dead, a sense of propriety, would have forbidden them to expose their dead bodies in so shocking a manner without burial. Malice might kill the body, but publick sentiment and common good feelings would have preserved their dead bodies so shameless violation. But in the Providence of God, they were brought into a situation more desperate than individual malice could effect. There was a power that could destroy them in the valley of Hinnom, without the mitigation of any of its terrors, in spite of friendship or respect or humanity or decency. And all these things were to come and did come on that generation.

In the passages which I have quoted, the valley of Hinnom is mentioned eleven times, or the Greek word Gehenna, but in our English Testament it is unfortunately called hell. In all these instances it is mentioned in addressing the Jews. The word occurs but once more in the New Testament, and then also it is addressed to Jews. St. James is the writer who mentions it, and it is remarkable that he expressly addresses his Epistle or letter "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad." St. James, however, does not name Gehenna as a place of punishment, but merely brings to view its odiousness. He says "The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of the valley of Hinnom." His meaning will probably be received correctly by all my hearers; that the polluting and abominable language which proceeds from the tongue of brutish men, or the corrupt passions which set the tongue in motion, will admit of a comparison with that odious centre of abominations, called Gehenna or the valley of Hinnom.

The Greek word Gehenna, occurs just twelve times in the New Testament. In all these instances we read in our English Testaments, "hell," but the place spoken of is the valley of Hinnom.

If I made myself intelligible in giving the history of the valley of Hinnom, I trust my hearers are qualified to take the meaning of all the passages in which it is mentioned by our Lord and St. James. I presume we clearly perceive why our Lord entered into no explanations of his meaning, and why the Jews, even his disciples, asked for none. They all knew the valley of Hinnom. It lay on the south side of Zion's hill They all knew its odious history, and the fearful prophecy, that it should become the valley of slaughter. As *we* find no difficulty in understanding our Lord, after learning the situation and history of the place, and the prophecies respecting it, so *they* asked no explanations and needed none.

I wish to offer several considerations to show, or rather to strengthen the conviction of my hearers, that the valley of Hinnom or Gehenna, is a place well known to the Jews, and in the vicinity of Jerusalem, where it had been predicted that transgressors should be cast; and that it is not a place in a future state of exisence, where their carcases, their whole body, their two hands or two feet should be cast in the midst of fire or worms.

1. After taking a view of all the passages in which Gehenna is mentioned in the New Testament, we all perceive that no New Testament writer of apostle, in addressing the Gentiles, ever made mention of this place. And we perceive with equal clearness, that as they have not named it to them, they have not mentioned it to them as a place of future punishment. But if it were that place in a future state, where they were in danger of eternal wretchedness, surely they were interested to know it; and more than common penetration must be necessary to discover why it was not once mentioned to them either in speaking or writing.

2. We are all capable of noticing, that our Lord is the only person, who is recorded as having named Gehenna as a place of punishment. St. James names it once in his Epistle, but not as a place of punishment, as we have already had occasion to observe. When, therefore, we perceive that the strongest language used by our Lord is taken from the Old Testament, or is similar to language there applied to temporal things, we are abundantly prepared to infer that the punishment of the valley of Hinnom, spoken of in the prophets, and alluded to by him was to take place in this world. Indeed it is once predicted by our Lord, that it should come, as it did come, on that generation which were living in his day.

3. The Jews knew no other sense to the punishments of the valley of Hinnom, but the prophecied punishment of the Old Testament. Nothing appears in our Lord's language, which leads us to suppose that he thought them ignorant of the place, where their transgressors should be punished, or of the nature of the punishment, which would be inflicted on them there. Nor does it appear that they apprehended any other meaning, or were impressed with a belief that their afflictions were to take place in an invisible state of being.

4. It is obvious to remark that the punishment of the valley of Hinnom is never spoken of as the punishment of the spirit, separate from the body. It is the body or carcase, which is subject to fire and worms.

5. It is a fact worthy of notice, that the sal-

vation revealed in the Gospel is never spoken of as a salvation from the punishments of the valley of Hinnom, considered as of eternal duration, although sincere believers among the Jews would escape those punishments such as they were. No such salvation was preached by Christ or his apostles. One of the effects of salvation would be to rescue Jews, more particularly citizens of Jerusalem, from the ruin of the valley of Hinnom, or as it is commonly translated hell. But its object was to withdraw them from sinning. Our Lord received his name Jesus because he should save his people from their sins; not merely from the valley of Hinnom. Our Lord and his apostles proposed to turn men from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God, from idols to serve the living God; from the vices and follies of the world to purity, wisdom and honour.

6. The conduct of our Lord and his apostles are such as would naturally flow from the views which we have obtained on this subject. Neither he nor they ever mention Gehenna punishments to the Gentiles, or any people but Jews. When he speaks of them it is to Jews only, and in nine out of eleven instances to his disciples, who should escape them. To other Jews he merely says, "how can ye escape the damnation of the valley of Hinnom?" or, as we read in the English New Testament, "hell."

In order that believers might escape the valley of Hinnom, our Lord points out in a very particular manner, how they might know when that judgement approached, and what they must do to escape it. He says, "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation," or an army prepared to desolate, "stand in the holy place (whoso readeth let him understand) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountain; let him who is on the house top not come down to take any thing out of his house; neither let him who is in the field return back to take his clothes—for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time; no, nor ever shall be."

7. In the Holy scriptures there are four words, neither of them meaning hell or a place of eternal punishment in a future state of existence, yet all translated by that single word. These words are Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, which signifies the valley of Hinnom. I know not how to express my regret that errours of such magnitude have crept into the translation of the scriptures. It might justly, though severely, be asked, if king James' translators believed there was a plurality of hells. Those who have had knowledge enough to discern the difficulty in which this mistranslation involved us, have undertaken to discriminate and determine which of those words is really the name of a place of eternal punishment beyond the grave. They soon discovered that it is not Hades, Sheol or Tartarus, but some have not penetration, or knowledge enough to determine, that the valley of Hinnom, or Gehenna was not the place, and therefore they concluded that the word Gehenna designated a future and eternal hell, in an invisible state of being. I have no occasion to assure my hearers, on my authority that they were mistaken. The history of the valley of Hinnom, and the prophecies respecting it, speak for themselves. I would only encourage any, who may have the means to obtain more correct translations of the scriptures, if they can be found, and compare them with that in common use which was made more than two hundred years ago.

Since these several hells have disappeared, the wisdom of man has erected conscience into a hell of eternal punishment. But, I trust that true wisdom will at length decide, that this opinion also is erroneous. If the word hell is used at all, since it is found unscriptural, I would not object to that use of language which calls conscience the *true* hell, although I could not admit of the application of the epithet *eternal*.—Let me say at once, I do not regard conscience as a principle implanted in man for purposes of infinite and eternal revenge. Oh, no. Far be the thought, that God is inexorable. On the contrary, I regard conscience as a self-purifying power, established in man, like certain principles in outward nature, to prevent eternal desolation and ruin. In proportion as this power is exerted, the more speedy will be the restoration. In the summer months, when the animal and vegetable kingdoms droop under the heat of a burning sun, and the air seems deprived of its life-giving qualities; suddenly a cloud appears in the west; the lightning flashes and the thunder rolls; soon the descending torrents fall on the earth; the corn is watered in the furrows and the grass in the field, and grateful man inhales with delight the cool, purified and sweet scented air. Again, when contagion spreads over a country, and human nature sickens under its influence; when friend looks on friend as devoted to the fearful ravages of the destroyer; then, the storm and the hurricane come as the messengers of God's love, and sweep over the land and terrify the heart, but drive away captive before them contagion and death. So it is with the soul. Does any one suppose that God can give such splendid powers to outward nature; that he can establish such an efficient principle of self-purification in mere unthinking inanimate matter; yet cannot establish such a power in the rational, reflecting, peace-seeking mind? As we discern such a principle in nature, so we discern a similar principle in the human soul. Such a principle is conscience; and there is reason to think, although contagion is permitted in the soul, and clouds and thick darkness are allowed to gather upon it, that the thunderings and lightnings of conscience, internal storms and tempests will sweep away contagion and death, and restore corrupted and afflicted human nature to righteousness and peace.

Before concluding this discourse I wish to offer a few remarks.

1. The fact that four words in the sacred writings are translated into English by one and the same word, hell, is decisive proof of the importance and wisdom of laying our minds open to receive instruction. When we see so striking an illustration of the confusion in which religious truth has existed, who can fail to wish that those choice instruments in the hands of God, who are now waked up to the pursuit of pure knowledge, and an uncorrupted faith, may press forward, and may be long preserved and abundantly strengthened to fulfil their task.

2. Instead of regretting that an acquaintance with Jewish history and geography has shewn us that the valley of Hinnom is in this world and not in another; we ought to rejoice as believers in a spiritual religion, that the great outward terrour of a hell is removed, and that men are now more likely to turn their attention to those sacrifices and troubles of a mental, spiritual, hearfelt nature, to which they are subjected by a course of sin. Now, the goodness of God, not the vengeance, may lead men to repentance; now the love of Christ may constrain us; now, the voice of wisdom, since it speaks more distinctly in tones of affection, may be listened to and obeyed. I hope that now the spirit of our spiritual religion will appear more generally in the lives of its believers.

3. The progress of knowledge tends to establish the religion of Christ. We ought to consider that Christianity takes hold of the reflecting mind, in proportion as it is purified of its dross, and we have reason to think that we have real knowledge of its truths. And while the faith of men strengthens with the progress of light, the influence of religion on their hearts will be more benevolent and purifying. Truth is not calculated to injure the rational mind, but all darkness and doubt, delusion and especially violent rejection of the truth tends to injure it more than men readily conceive.

Finally, we are called to notice the misery brought on the Jewish people in consequence of transgression. What must have been the feelings of relatives and friends to behold the dear objects of their affection cast out unburied, to be food for the beasts of the earth and the fowls of the air. Without believing in eternal punishment, which is a gross idea, and reflects on the divine character; there is that in the nature of sin and the consequences which it involves, sufficient, we would think, to warn men against it, while virtue is followed by a good conscience and a peace which passes all understanding. Our interest is to follow wisdom. She standeth in the top of high places, by the way in the places of the paths, and stretches forth both her pleading arms, and holds out her rich rewards to every passenger—riches and honour are in her left hand, and in her right hand health and long life.—Prov. viii. 2, iii. 16.

THE ESSAYIST.

THE TIMES.

NO. III.

Having at length disposed of some matter from correspondents that demanded admission, and having paid sufficient attention to the charges, implicating our orthodoxy, preferred againgt us by our friends, who, it is probable, are less acquainted with the ground over which we have travelled than we are, and by those who perhaps read more than they think, and believe more than they read, we return with pleasure to greet our readers once more under the Essayist.

We promised some farther remarks on the subject of education. No subject is by the writer of this, deemed more important, and none deserves a more serious attention from any one, who regards himself as one of the human family. The proper instruction of youth, is matter of grave concern, for on it depends the solution of the question, whether MIND shall go forward, or whether it shall sink back into the feebleness of ignorance and false learning, which so long held the human race in worse than Egyptian bondage. Yet, this is an enquiry we cannot readily answer. It will perhaps be profitable to look farther at the defects of the present system, and it may be, the errours of others will teach us wisdom.

It has already been stated as one prominent objection to the present system of education that it does not teach the learner to think, nor to reason. Hence, perhaps, the cause why there are so many *dull* scholars, and why there are so many bright and active children who hate the school and loathe a book. A mistake runs through the whole system, and is imbibed by almost every teacher and every parent, that children have peculiar gifts, that unless they have a natural taste for the acquisition of certain branches, they cannot learn them.

I would these persons, in some other respects, would believe more in nature and less in education; but in this instance their creed should be reversed.

"What man has done man may do," is a maxim that should be engraved over the door of every school house, and instead of a child being told he has no genius for such a branch, he should be taught mind is omnipotent. Children have *no natural* bias for one study more than another; and I have never seen any possessing the common mental faculties, but are capable of acquiring all the knowledge taught in any of our schools, and acquiring it in half the time and with half the expense usually employed. Children are fond of new things, fond of new ideas,; and if our teachers would give them ideas instead of compelling them to commit to memory words and sentences they do not understand, there would be litte difficulty in fixing the attention of the most unpromising and least tractable.

Let us look at one of our common schools and point out the curious method adopted by most of our teachers. To begin with the teacher,—he has learned (it is very doubtful whether he knows,) to read, that is to call his letters and words as he sees them, in some style or other, with a good deal facility. If he happens to be *educated* under one who had learned to pronounce correctly, we may, probably, find not much to condemn in his pronounciation of all words he remembers to have heard his master pronounce; but if he has not a pronouncing dictionary in his hand, it is best to stop our ears when he comes to any others. So much for single words. In the enuciation of sentences, all rules of emphasis and cadence are murdered, and if he reads for any length of time, you may yawn at his monotony or wish him whipped for his affectation. The sense or meaning of the author—that is a thing quite unknown and even unthought of—If the piece be poetry, you wonder where is its harmony, and are strongly inclined to look over his shoulder to ascertain whether every line begins with a capital.

Having examined him in reading, question him on orthography. He may perhaps know letters are divided into vowels and consonants, and perhaps a consonant cannot make a syllable of itself. Farther, it is very doubtful whether he can proceed. On etymology and syntax, if he has a good memory he may tell you what the grammar book says, but of the reason or propriety of ono of the rules he recites, it is very doubtful whether he has any idea at all. In arithmetick we may find him able to answer most of the questions set down in his book as far as the RULE OF THREE, and some may go farther. Thus far the writer was enabled to go, when quite a boy the inspectors certified that he was qualified to teach a common school, and he was deemed quite "good in figures." The higher branches of mathematicks are not much taught in our common schools, though when they are, it is little more than committing to memory what is found in the text book.

In geography a little may be known, but in most cases the teacher refers to his book, to ascertain whether the scholar has answered right or not. He may have some acquaintance with history, at least, so far as to remember that in "Adam's fall we sinned all," and with natural history enough to say, the "cat doth play and often slay." He may perhaps, know enough about rhetorick to tell you Blair has written Lectures on the subject, and he may recollect that Duncan or watts or somebody has written a treatise on Logick. As to his general literature and refinement of taste, nothing need be said for little of these is ever exhibited. He may have read Watts' psalms, the New-England Primer, and some other books. In the art of thinking—the extent is, that he shall spend a winter easier in imparting his knowledge and 'teaching the young idea how to shoot,' than he can in driving through the storm and cold at some useful employment.

Such is the teacher. I would not be understood as meaning this is the character of all school teachers, but still it is an unexaggerated picture of a vast number, and I fear a large majority of the common school teachers in this state. Now how much are we to expect from this teacher? Let us examine his course of instruction.

The teacher comes into his school, sour, ready to eat up his scholars, or with an affected dignity makes them afraid to ask him a single question, or to state a single difficulty. The child is presented with a book, at the knee of the master, with the question, while the knife, perhaps, points to the first letter in the alphabet, 'what is that?' and thus to each letter till the whole alphabet is gone over. The little boy or girl is then sent to a hard seat where it must stay, motionless and noiseless, without any thing to arouse or call forth the young mind for an hour and a half. Thus, day after day, the child is sent to school. If fatigued, if feeling the buoyancy of the age and the desire to be active common to that period, a laugh or a whisper is discovered, the stentorian lungs of the teacher are in requsition, perhaps his rod—the little urchin is half frighted out of his wits—learns little more than to hate the school and dread to hear the parent tell him to go.

Having got out of the A B C's, he finds no more encouragement. Still it is the dry tedious task of learning mechanically, learning to spell words, the meaning of which he does not know nor can he guess the use. He is then put into a reading lesson and begins to read, no—man—may—put—off—the—law—of—God; without once thinking, or being required to think, of the meaning of what he is reading. The same defect runs through the whole course of studies in the school. The teachers give few explanations, they encourage few questions, for they are unable to answer them. Thus it is, time is squandered, money wasted, and children destoyed at school. But, I will not pursue the disgusting picture.

Children should be taught, wherever it is possible, by having the objects with which they are to become acquainted presented to them. Let them examine and the voice of the teacher give a description. Let reading be thought as an amusement, give the child a description which he is anxious to learn, and he will soon master it. Study should be his pastime, and instruction should be given in a manner not only plain but interesting. Give to the young mind ideas, keep the boy awake with novelty, be pleasant to him, and teach him as though you were telling him a story to please him.—But I haev not time to enlarge.

EQUALITY,—NO. I.

The man who is capable of looking on human society with the eye of a philosopher, who can compare causes and effects, trace the secret springs of actions, and determine the influence of prevailing institutions, will readily perceive the cause of the crime and misery, now prevalent, is chiefly owing to the inequality which exists among us, and which almost every institution tends to perpetuate and increase.

Perhaps it is not possible to bring all to the same standard, while individual enterprise is allowed, and allowed it must be, unless we would destroy society, it is hardly to be expected that all will be of the same size, that all will be equally successful. But it were a mournful truth, a depressive thought, to say nothing can be done, that we cannot lessen the distance between the parts or classes as they now exist. It were thinking meanly of man, meanly of his social powers, to say he is susceptible of no better state of society than the present. It were indeed paying little attention to past experience, as well as turning blindly from what may be seen in almost every exertion of which we are capable.

There is no natural difference between the members of society. The child of the poor is not, when born, more ignorant or more helpless than the child of the rich. In acquiring knowledge, the children of the opulent and powerful are not more apt, nor do they learn with greater ease, or distinguish with greater accuracy, than those of an opposite description. The ornament of science has often been the child of poverty, and the lower classes of society have yielded as great geniuses as the world can boast. There is not then, in the physical or intellectual powers of mankind, any reason why one class should be oppressed, why one should be called the higher and the other the lower. Nor, indeed, is there any thing in their moral natures which should continue the inequality which now exists. The reason why we should despair of a reform, if despair we must, is found somewhere else.

The reason is not abstruse; it is on the surface, and the stupified may understand, and the blind almost see it. No matter how society become thus divided. It is divided, and we may see what perpetuates this division.—

We have a privileged class which sprung up during ignorant ages. Time has confirmed their power, and long habit has made us conclude we cannot live without them. We have the clergy, a non-productive class, who, in this country, consume annually twenty millions of dollars. These are employed to do what every man could do a great deal better for himself. They watch the interests of religion. But religion is a thing between the individual and his God; and it is much better for the individual to go directly to the throne of grace and pray for himself, than it is to hire a priest to do it for him. For whatever we would have well done, we should do ourselves, and not employ a hireling. But this class obtain a livelihood from their calling; consequently they will do all they can to flatter themselves and those who support them, their order is necessary.

Another class, an unproductive class, in many respects a privileged class, live upon the earnings of others, and trample upon those who support them—the lawyers. These men are but a moth to us. They professionally pretend to aid individuals in obtaining justice; but by the uncertainty they introduce into the laws, by the ambiguous manner in which laws themselves are framed, the aid becomes doubtful, for it is no sign a man has the right because he succeeds, or that he is wrong because he failed. Laws are always an evil, the less we have of them the better. We send men to our Legislature, we pay them high wages; they frame or enact, at every session, a large number of laws, drawn up with that peculiar ambiguity that, without a seven years study, the most talented cannot hope to understand them. Instead of taking common sense and natural justice for our guide, we attempt to shape our actions according to these untelligible laws, get into a dispute and spend our whole fortune to pay the law to help us out.

Now if this class were all employed in cultivating the earth, and the legislators were compelled to *fast* till they had transacted their business, or until they learned old laws should be just before they made new ones, that old duties should be defined before additional ones are imposed, we might hope for something valuable. The best law is a high moral feeling, and the best lawyer is he who can best draw forth the moral and intellectual faculties of the youth. Law never made a man honest, but it has made many a man bankrupt, not only in wealth but in integrity and in respectability. Let laws be simplified, be reduced in number and always founded on natural justice; let legislators follow the plough, and lawyers obtain their fee by pursuing the employment of the agriculturalist or the mechanick, and we should soon see crime diminishing and equality prevailing. But the lawyer will oppose this innovation.

Perhaps the inequality which reigns between the rich and the poor is the most destructive to peace and virtue. One man has a capital, he may employ it in agriculture; he finds the poor, sets them to work; if their number be great, and nobody else to employ them, he reduces their wages so low that though they may live, they can never hope to be otherwise than poor. These labourers have families, and thus the number which must depend on the rich for employment, and on the wages he may please to give for a support, is constantly in-

creasing, and the wages will diminish in proportion to the number of the labourers. Hence it is the labouring class of community are soon reduced to the lowest state of wretchedness.

A man has some hundred thousand dollars. He erects a large manufacturing establishment. The market is empty. The Tariff or something else, excludes foreign competition; demand is high; he employs a large number of labourers, men women and children; gives decent wages and still finds it profitable. Others have also a capital; other establishments are erected; the market is soon supplied; thence follows a reduction of wages. The labourer must work more hours, produce more to obtain the same support. But this greater production gluts the market, a surplus is produced, and this reduces the wages still lower; and, it will be found, the more the labourer produces the poorer he grows. This seems a hard case, that plenty should increase poverty, a surplus should produce want. Yet so it is. The inequality which exists tends to perpetuate and increase itself.

But, there is a greater evil, not yet mentioned. While one class labours and the other enjoys, the labouring class will always be considered the lowest. A new scale of worth will be introduced, the reverse of what it should be. A man will be respected in proportion to his idleness. Hence, the labourer learns to loathe his labour, he is impatient of his employment, he is anxious to be rich, that he may be idle and be respected. Now spring the temptations to crime. The struggle to be rich commences; all ties are forgotten; all principles of honour and morality are abandoned. Fair means or foul, the intention is to be rich. Some perhaps are stimulated by want to relieve themselves, others anxious to place themselves on a level with those who consider themselves above them. Crime becomes frequent —jails and gibbets are in requisition, &c.

This theme need not be pursued. The remarks made elicit the inequality which exists, they show the evil which flow from it, and also that it is for the apparent interest of the higher classes to promote it. Something ought to be done. Political doctors manage this subject very poorly, and religious doctors still worse. Religious teachers tell the poor to be content, for if poor here, they shall be rich hereafter. Political teachers devise means to increase the surplus produce, blindly imagining abundance will remove the evil when in fact we already produce more than enough. We may prohibit the manufactures of other nations, and this may afford temporary relief, but it is only an opiate that may calm but can not remove the disease.

Equality must be introduced. Every man should produce for himself, or every one should be engaged in some branch of productive industry. This would secure to each one a competence. In those branches which the individual can not master, the principle of co-operation may be introduced. But there should be no such thing as a labouring class, and consuming class, one separate from the other. Secure to every man the products of his own labour, and the evil will disappear. These are only a few hints thrown out, on which we intend to enlarge as we have leisure, particularly to point out how the proposed plan may be carried into effect.—[EDITOR.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

LET US AWAKE.

We take the liberty to call the attention of our readers to the articles now publishing under the head of "Church and State." These articles are the result of much observation on the present, as well as pretty extensive acquaintance with the history of the clergy in past ages. The lessons they inculcate are believed by the writer not only true, but peculiarly appropriate to the present state of religious excitement.

We have frequently reminded our friends and the publick, that there is serious cause of danger from the movements of the orthodox religionists—danger, because the enemy appears under a name we all respect, and is supported by men of the highest standing, making great pretensions to piety and virtue. This enemy is a Protean monster. He can assume any shape, and by turns he addresses himself to every passion, and strikes every cord which can vibrate to his own pleasure and interest.

There is nothing more ungrateful, nor even more dangerous, than to oppose the measures of a party professedly religious. Under that holy name, it would seem the foulest plots may be engendered, and the most insidious designs fostered and ripened to execution. Yet, if you sound the alarm, if you bid your countrymen beware, if you call upon the friends of equal rights to unite for the preservation of their liberties, of good order and of good feeling, you are branded "infidels," "opposers of religion," "enemies to God," "wicked disorganizers of society," &c. These appellations have been liberally heaped upon the writer of this article, and if he could for a moment hesitate between duty and apparent interest, he would have been silent, and left the task of a watchman to others. But circumstances have placed us upon the walls of Zion; whatever be the danger, we shall not shrink from our post; and however much we may wish to be at peace with all men, and to pass a quiet life, our breast is bared to the shafts of the enemy, and we are determined to sign no ignominious truce, or to encourage a shameful treaty. The line is drawn, the sides are taken, the forces are called out, the tempest lowers, and the combat rages. Every thing is at stake. Liberty, mental freedom, every thing dear to man is safe in the triumph of one party—ignoble slavery, base degraded servitude to an unholy, priestly despotism is our doom, if the other prevail.

Do we ask for facts? Facts there are at hand. Look at that pattern of piety, the orthodox Sabbath-keeping line of stages, "the Pioneer." What was its avowed object? To cheapen the expense, or to facilitate the means of travelling? No. It was called the "Lord's Line," and all who rode in the "Old Line," one which had long been established and supported by men who deserved well of the publick—all who preferred this line to the "Pioneer" were represented as travelling to hell, they were ranked with *swindlers*, *rogues*, and such like characters.

What were we taught by this piety line? Simply, that no stage proprietor, no owner of a boat on the Canal, no merchant, no mechanick, no tradesmen, and no professional man whatever, should be encouraged in what might be his only means of obtaining a living for himself and family, unless he could support what a certain class of divines declared it his duty to support. Yet these divines tell you they are opposed to *coercion*: yes, forsooth, but they are not opposed to *starving* a man into compliance. This man is a mechanick; his living depends upon his finding employment, or a sale for his wares. But he does not, for instance, keep the Sabbath as some say he ought. He then can find no employment, no purchasers for his wares, for all have determined they will not encourage such a man. How will he find bread for himself and family? How will he provide for his wife? how rear his little ones to respectability? He must bow to the unholy alliance—he must turn traitor to his conscience—pretend reverence for that he does not reverence—he must be a hypocrite before he can obtain a living. This would be freedom! Heaven forefend!

Yet such are the tendencies of the measures supported by the orthodox party. One year ago, in this quarter at least, we perceived it. Have we fallen asleep? or has the danger abated? Abated it has not. The Pioneer still runs, a disgrace to community, an insult to religion. How is it supported? By money begged from community. In these hard times agents are going the rounds to churches, to procure funds from charity to support it. Base iniquity!

All the other measures are in operation; and it should be known the Sabbath keeping folks have resolved to make another attack on Congress to stop the Mail. They were repulsed last year, but they may not be this. They may not find a Col. Johnson on the committee. They may succeed. If they do, they have a precedent, an "opening wedge," and what may they not attempt to carry by a petition? They may then ask for "a wise *national creed*;" they may ask for the publick lands; they may ask for the mail to put into their *pious* line of stages, so they can increase their monopoly; they may ask, we cannot tell for what; but this is certain, the great principle of religious liberty is now involved in this question of Sabbath Mails. It has assumed such a shape that, if the petitioners succeed, it is the triumph of ecclesiastical domination. It is therefore important measures should be immediately taken to check the progress of fanaticism and intolerance.

It was supposed that, driven from the halls of Congress, they would not renew the attack; but they intend their partial defeat shall be turned into victory. Citizens of a free government, remember you are free only by your own vigilance and virtue. Deceive not yourselves by imagining a security you do not possess. While men slept, the enemy sowed his tares among the wheat. Let us be on our guard. We think the enemy weak, we take no precautions—he improves this negligence to increase his power. We think him honest or harmless; he snatches this to insinuate himself into our confidence, and it will be well if we dash the poisoned chalice from our lips ere we drain its contents. We think him holy: with a pious face he grasps our purse, that may be payed for forging our fetters. These are not idle fears, but would to God they were.

Our country is dear to every freeman. Here the Genius of Liberty, after having been successively expelled from every clime, thought to erect her temple and find a land to call her home. She saw in the bright visions of hope the future sons and daughters of this Republick sporting in freedom, enjoying the rights of their nature, and rising to the highest pitch of human greatness, preparing to teach the world to be free. But the vision is blasted; the whispers of hope are false; and our Republick, like Athens or Rome, may sigh under the whip of the despot, unless we guard well every appearance of danger, watch with the most jealous eye the dominant spirit of ecclesiastical dignitaries.

Something must be done. We pronounced the word "union" among all the liberals. We repeat it, and would to heaven it could be echoed from every *independent* press in the country, whatever may be its creed;—Union, for the preservation of our rights, the perpetuity of our free institutions, for the liberty of free enquiry, and the exercise of such religions as each individual may choose, without his being praised or censured;—Union to defeat the mad attempts of zealots and ambitious priests, and to teach the world man is capable of self government. Editors should treat this subject fearlessly and powerfully: every one, who sees the danger, should point it out to his neighbour, till all shall see and all be awake.

Let our wranglings cease; stop contending about the niceties of polemical theology. All is at stake.—Let us win our freedom, banish tyranny and priestly arrogance, and then we may attend to these fooleries, which distract the brain. But let a sense of common danger suspend all our intestine divisions. Let us awake and bend all our powers to the great question—SHALL MAN BE FREE?—[*Editor.*

CHURCH AND STATE.—NO. 5.

But few remarks are here required to place the extracts made in our last, in their true light. The authours of the circular seem confident the various measures which they mention, and which the orthodox clergy advocated with characteristick zeal at that time, and which they cherish with all of maternal fondness at this time—the authours seem con-

fident these measures will result "in a wise national creed." This seems to have been, at the date of the circular, the object of their wishes, and we shall soon proceed to show their disposition has not changed.

By forming this combination, or by bringing about this consolidation of the principal religious denominations, and thus enlisting "numerical force" on their side, "all the opposition from infidelity will be borne down and overpowered." Now this term "infidelity" is a word of vague import, very different in its meaning at Rome than at Constantinople. It means, however, in religious parlance, whatever opposes the orthodox, or predominant religion in the country in which it is used. It is the chief weapon of the orthodox, the principal argument used by the clergy to silence those who are doubtful about the propriety of their measures. It is thrown as a mark, and the person to whom it is applied is designated to destruction, or as deserving the abhorrence of those who love the clergy. Still, to an enlightened mind, the application of the term is a badge of honour; as in fact the word infidel denotes a person who prefers honesty to hypocrisy, and liberty and mental freedom with the few, to slavery with the many. The clergy would overpower all infidels, stop their voices, and prevent them from enjoying those rights for which our fathers fought, bled and died.

This topick must not be so soon dismissed. There is a large class of our population, aye, and the very bone and marrow, if you please, of our population, who study rather the ordinary concerns of life than theology; who, having the interest of their country at heart, have not found leisure to attend to all the nice distinctions, invisible to all but theological eyes, in which religion is made to consist.—These persons, marking the contending factions of religionists, the general uncertainty of all their speculations, adopt a moral practice for themselves; or, at least, treat the great topicks of dispute among zealots with indifference, and sometimes, perhaps, with silent contempt. These men, heretofore, have been our publick spirited citizens; they have been our warm hearted patriots; the defenders of our country, the framers of our constitution; our magistrates, representatives, and presidents. Under this description is ranked a Franklin, a Jefferson, a Madison, and by far the larger number who are conspicuous in our history, a large share of those whose virtues have rendered our republick illustrious, who have pointed out to her the path of glory.

But these persons, by the orthodox, would be accounted infidels, because they professed but little and practiced much. These persons, by the religionists, are held up as mournful proof of the depravity of human nature, as men with superb talents, but destitute of grace; and who, with all their excellencies, with all their virtues, with all the utility of their lives, are now probably suffering the gnawings of that worm which never dies. Instead of teaching the youth to imitate their virtues and their usefulness, the clergy tell them to avoid their practices, and to look with horrour upon their want of zeal for the church.

But these persons are persons of this description, who have filled the publick offices in the gift of a free people with so much dignity, with so much usefulness and glory to their country, are to be "borne down and overpowered," compelled to become sectarians before they can hold any publick office, hypocrites before they can be trusted with the publick good. Such a course would soon stamp our republican government with infamy; would, to the no small joy of all crowned heads, overthrow our free institutions, and rear a detested monarchy on the ruins of liberty. It were indecent to express our abhorrence of this plan, or the indignation it must excite in every enlightened, in every patriotick bosom. But such, fellow citizens, is the avowed object of our idolized priests, to effect which they declare themselves at work. We would invoke the shades of the martyrs of our revolution to frown indignant upon such measures, and upon the shameless avowal of them. We may not be endangered, but alas, we may feel too secure. There is something rotten, there is something wrong, when a class of men, so numerous and so powerful as the orthodox clergy, dare avow such sentiments, or when they can even embrace them.

The clergy seem anxious to be distinguished by a "national costume," which, "*solemn and imposing*," will secure the "sacerdotal character" its dignity. Not willing to trust to the naked beauty of religion, and rest their dignity on the utility of their lives, on the benevolence of their characters, they are ambitious of a *dress* which shall extort unmeritted respect, and give them undue influence which they despair of obtaining by the simplicity of their doctrines, or from the beneficence of their practice.

"These anticipations," they think, "will be realized in securing an appropriation of a portion of publick lands, to a limited and yet a sufficient number of clergy, and to a well defined course of education." There is no diffiulty in comprehending this sentence. If the clergy were always equally intelligible, the world would not be disgraced by religious contentions, nor the church deformed with incomprehensible dogmas. Congress has the care of large tracts of publick lands—some very valuable, and almost indescribably excellent. These lands would make a fine patrimony for the church.

Reader, how do you think the clergy expect to grasp these lands? Such men as Col.

Johnson would not be too ready to bestow such valuable presents upon a class of men who have abused him and all other patriots, who have disturbed the ashes of the dead, and branded with reproach those who gained our independence. But think ye of no feasible plan? Let none be members of Congress but those who are devoted to the clergy—none but those who depend on the orthodox for their votes—let none but these have charge of our publick lands, and how long would it require to obtain a law appropriating a part or all of these lands to the service of the church? If the orthodox could govern the polls, these men would fear no publick censure, they would be supported in their unhallowed measures.

Have not the orthodox a plan adopted; have they not avowed it their intention to support no man for office, unless he is sound in the faith? Whether so or not, what we have alledged shows very clearly the orthodox are determined to receive some state patronage; that they are labouring to gain for themselves an establishment that will interfere with the rights of our citizens; that they are labouring to accomplish an object which menaces with death every spark of genuine liberty. True, we are told the people of these United States are too well enlightened to ever submit to this. It may be so. We pray God the result may prove it so. But of one thing we feel confident, that if we remain inactive, boasting how well we are enlightened, we may regret that we had not deemed ourselves more ignorant.

The disposition which we charged to the clergy, appears, from what has been said, evidently theirs. But we have more facts to offer—language which speaks, or should speak, in a voice of thunder to every freeman. We shall present our readers with the part of a famous sermon of Doct. E. S. Ely, of Philadelphia, preached on the anniversary of our independence, deemed an appropriate discourse for our nation's jubilee. The extracts we shall make have been already before our readers, but they should be repeated till every one gets them by heart; till every manly principle of his bosom burns with honest indignation at the unhallowed spirit which dictated them. They form a link in our chain of evidences, and ought not to be left out. Had the authour of the sermon a conscience, and did he believe in the awful day of judgment about which he preaches, he would tremble lest this sermon should rise up against him, and condemn him to that hell to which he so liberally dooms the infidel and the heretical. But God is merciful, and we rejoice to think that even Ezra Stiles Ely will yet become holy and happy.

It is only necessary to remark, Dr. Ely is one of the leading members of the Presbyterian church, being standing clerk of their general assembly, and the one often pitched upon to write and publish their reports. No censure has been passed upon him for this publication by the church to which he belongs, though that church has not been sparing in its denunciations upon those who have condemned his sentiments. From the high standing of the man, and the general approbation of his party, together with many other circumstances not necessary to mention now, we consider the sermon official, as authorized, at least, bearing the implied sanction of the whole Presbyterian order in the United States. We would not be uncharitable, nor would we degrade charity to mere blindness and credulity: but here follow the extracts—they may speak for themselves.

"Let it be distinctly stated and fearlessly maintained in the first place, that every member of this christian nation, from the highest to the lowest, ought to serve the Lord with fear, and yield his sincere homage to the Son of God. Every ruler *should* be an avowed, and a sincere friend of Christianity. He should know and believe the doctrines of our holy religion, and act in conformity with its precepts. This *he ought* to do; because as a man he is required to serve the Lord; and as a publick ruler, he is called upon by divine authority 'to kiss the Son.'

"Our rulers, like any other members of the community, who are under law to God as rational being, and under law to Christ, since they have the light of divine revelation, ought to search the scriptures, assent to the truth, profess faith in Christ, keep the Sabbath holy to God, pray in private, and in the domestick circle, attend on the publick ministry of the word, be baptized, and celebrate the Lord's Supper. None of our rulers have the consent of their Maker that they should be Pagans, Socinians, Mussulmans, Deists, the opponents of Christianity."

"In other words, our Presidents, Secretaries of the Government, Senators, and other Representatives in Congress, Governours of States, Judges, State Legislators, Justices of the Peace, and city Magistrates, are just as much bound as any other persons in the United States, to be *orthodox* in their faith, and virtuous and religious in their whole deportment. They may no more lawfully be bad husbands, wicked parents, men of *heretical opinions*, or men of dissolute lives, than the obscure individual who would be sent to Bridewell for his blasphemy and debauchry.

"God, my hearers, requires a Christian faith, a *Christian profession*, and a Christian practice of all our publick men; and we as Christian citizens ought, by the publication of our opinions, to require the same.

"Secondly—Since it is the duty of all our rulers to serve the Lord and kiss the Son of God, it must be most manifestly the duty of all our Christian fellow-citizens to honour the Lord Jesus Christ and promote Christianity

by electing and supporting as publick officers the friends of our blessed Saviour. If all the truly religious men of our nation would be punctual and persevering in their endeavours to have good men chosen to fill all our national and state offices of honour, power and trust, their weight would be soon felt by politicians; and those who care little for the religion of the Bible, would for their own interest, consult the reasonable wishes of the great mass of Christians throughout our land.

"I propose, fellow-citizens, a new sort of union, or, if you please, *a Christian party in politicks*, which I am exceedingly desirous all good men in our country should join; not by *subscribing a constitution* and the formation of a new society, but by adopting, avowing, and determining to act upon truly religious principles in all civil matters."

"If three or four of the most numerous denominations of Christians in the United States, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Methodists and Congregationalists for instance, should act upon this principle, our country would never be dishonoured with an *avowed Infidel* in her national cabinet or capitol. The *Presbyterians* alone could bring *half a million of electors* into the field, in opposition to any known advocate of Deism, Socinianism, or any other species of avowed hostility to the truth of christianity. If to the denominations above named we add the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in our country, the electors of these five classes of true Christians, united in the sole requisition of *apparent* friendship to Christianity in every candidate for office whom they will support, *could govern every publick election* in our country, without infringing in the least upon the charter of our civil liberties."

"It will be objected that my plan of a truly Christian party in politicks will make hypocrites. We are not answerable for their hypocrisy if it does."

"It will be objected, moreover, that my scheme of voting on political elections according to certain fixed religious principles, will create jealousies among the different denominations of Christians. But why should it? Our rulers which we have elected are of some, or of no religious sect. If they are of no religious denomination, they belong to the party of Infidels. If they are of any of the denominations of true Christians, it is better, in the judgment of all true Christians, that they should be of that one company than in the company of Infidels."

"I am free to avow, that other things being equal, I would prefer for my chief magistrate, and judge, and ruler, a sound Presbyterian; and every candid religionist will make the same declaration concerning his own persuasion; but I would prefer a religious and moral man, of any one of the truly Christian sects, to any man destitute of religious principle and morality."

"Let us all be Christian politicians, and govern ourselves by supreme love to our blessed Master, whether we unite in prayers or in the election of our civil rulers. Let us be as conscientiously religious at the polls as in the pulpit, or house of worship."

"Let us never support by our votes any immoral man, or any known contemner of any of the fundamental doctrines of Christ for any office; and least of all for the Presidency of these United States. Let us elect men who dare to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ for their Lord in their publick documents. Which of our Presidents have ever done this? It would pick no Infidel's pocket, and break no Jew's neck, if our President should be so singular as to let it be known that he is a *Christian* by his Messages, and an advocate for the Deity of Christ by his personal preference of a Christian temple to a Socinian conventicle. It would be no violation of our national constitution, if our members of Congress should quit reading of newspapers and writing letters on the Lord's day, at least during publick worship, in the Hall of Representatives.

"We are a Christian nation; we have a right to demand that all our rulers in their conduct shall conform to Christian morality; and if they do not, it is the duty and privilege of Christian freemen to make a new and a better election."

MR. BRIMBLECOM'S SERMON.

The Sermon of Mr. Brimblecom in this number of our paper will be read with profit. The argument may not, indeed, be new; but it will be found interesting and conclusive. We suppose the facts, stated in the discourse which go to show that there is no such thing as a local hell, are very well known to the most intelligent of all sects of christians, who are satisfied that there is no such place. For certain reasons, however, pertaining to self-interest, some of these persons choose to keep their knowledge to themselves, and make no effort to correct the errours of the less enlightened part of society. Not so with Mr. Brimblecom. As a friend to truth and to mankind, what he regards as important doctrines he hesitates not to avow and defend. Though a Unitarian Congregationalist, he has joined the Maine Convention of Universalists. We trust his doing this will cause no dissatisfaction or bad feelings on the part of Unitarians. It does not become them, indeed, if they are *liberal*, to withdraw their confidence, friendship and assistance from an individual merely because, that, while he regards them as brethren, he is also disposed to extend his fellowship to another denomination of christians whose views, after all, are substantially the same as our own.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

GOSPEL LIBERTY.

The true religion of Jesus Christ binds his followers by no more arbitrary law, than "the perfect law of liberty." Christianity, indeed, is the most "perfect" system of pure and rational "liberty" that was ever given to the world. It allows to every man the right of thinking for himself, and of speaking as he thinks; holding him accountable to no mere man or body of men, but making him answerable alone to the great author of our holy religion. "One is your Master even Christ, and all ye are brethren." "He that would be greatest amongst you, let him be your servant." It tells us, that "we have all one Father;" and, consequently, that no man has a right to exercise authority over another in matters of religious faith.—It exhorts them to break down all the narrow walls of sects, and to stand under the broad canopy of a common heaven, to breathe the pure, unpolluted air of freedom, and to rejoice in the light of that sun which shines alike on the evil and on the good; which sheds its rays impartially on every quarter of the globe.

Every thing that is hostile to the moral freedom of the human mind, is hostile to the religion of Jesus Christ. This saying to a man,—"You must believe as I believe, or you will be miserable forever: You must join my church, or you will be out of the ark of safety;"—this driving people into the fold of exclusive sects, and loading them with oppressive terms when there,—is all contrary to the religion of Jesus Christ. This was given to make mankind free; to set the human intellect at work in the boundless, but gloriously fruitful field of enquiry after truth. Under this system nothing but *personal* examination, *personal* faith and *personal* righteousness, will answer; and these things never dropped from the thong of the persecutor,—they never arose as the legitimate fruits of the flames of the faggot.

There is, amongst all the exclusive sects, much well invented machinery directed to the purpose of bringing men under the yoke of bondage—of subjecting them to the will, and of making them answer the designs, of certain ambitious leaders; and in many cases we know it operates with unfeeling and cruel severity. That man is not a freeman—and, consequently, not a real christian,—who especially in a land of civil and religious liberty, dares not think for himself, or who, if he does entertain opinions of his own forming, dares not avow them, but consents to support a cause in opposition to them.

In this country we are, all of us, in the habit of boasting of our civil and religious freedom; yet how few are there who seem to *exercise* that liberty of which they *boast* so loudly! It is true, that both under the genius of christianity and the civil institutions of the republick, personal freedom, in these matters, is secured to every man; but then there are other circumstances connected with the condition of a great number of individuals, which, if they do not take away that freedom, serve to keep it in the back ground and prevent its exercise. The influence of an erroneous education; the fear of incurring the displeasure of some from whom temporal favours are expected, or a regard to the wishes of families and friends, too often enslave the mind and stop the utterance of the tongue.

It is high time that men were told, that the system of christianity, as delivered to the world by its Author, is a FREE SYSTEM;—that it secures the most perfect liberty to every follower of Jesus, and would reproach him as *unworthy* of the blessing, who *dares not exercise it.*

It is an encouraging consideration that knowledge is increasing, and that with its increase, liberal views are extending. Too long have the children of men groaned in bondage under fearful apprehensions of the divine will in regard to their eternal destiny. The human mind has been deprived of that warm confidence in the protecting goodness of God, which is necessary to the happiness and moral health of mankind. But it is beginning to be seen, that the Sovereign of the universe is the Father of his creatures; that as such he is deserving their highest love and veneration, and that all his purposes are founded on that immutable goodness which knows no bounds. The dawn of a glorious day approaches—it has even now commenced. The "truth which maketh *free*" is, like the sun, travelling in the mightiness of its strength and is destined to deliver the world from all discouraging views of the divine economy, and to bless mankind with that rational freedom which places all men upon the level under the same common Parent, and that brings joy and peace to the ransomed sons of men.—May the full glories of that day soon come! when God shall be honoured as the eternal Father of all his dependent intelligences, and the hearts of men shall return to him with their best offerings of devotional gratitude.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

We are sincerely sorry for the writer of the following letter, and think if he will follow our advice, his troubles will be removed. It is simply to transmit by mail to us, the amount due, and thus relieve himself from the vexation of being dunned, and from the expense of postage on dunning letters.

We inform our subscribers that to facilitate collections where they cannot be conveniently paid to agents, all who owe for the 6th and 7th volumes of the Advocate may send on a three dollar bill subject to postage, and at our risque.

BUFFALO, AUGUST 8TH, 1829.

The Editor of the Gospel Advocate.

DEAR SIR.—I arrived here this evening, but had only a short time to remain: I inqui-

red for your agent both at this place and at Rochester, but could not find him at either place. I begged at the Rochester Hotel, and also at the Eagle in this place, to receive my arrearages and give me a receipt, but was refused in both instances. You have an agent in Cincinnati; and in passing through I will call and pay him, as I am really tired of being dunned, and at all times ready and willing to pay. Your dunning letters have cost me nearly one years subscription. Could I stop till monday, likely I could find your agent here, but it is now late, and the boat will start for Erie in an hour.

Yours Respectfully.

THE CRISIS,

Is at hand. Liberals of America, will you tamely give up your dearest rights without a single struggle? What means this apathy—this inattention to the schemes of the ungodly, who are compassing sea and land to gain proselytes to their creed? Why do you sit still while the emisaries of a crafty and designing priesthood accomplish their great end and aim—viz: the stoppage of the mail on Sunday? Why is not the voice of the friends of religious freedom also heard at the Capitol? Shall the friends of intellectual emancipation have a name to live while they are dead? No. Let every individual who values religious liberty, rise in the majesty of truth, and do his duty to his God, and his native land—*Gospel Herald.*

HELL—WHERE IS IT?

David says, "Great is thy mercy towards me, for thou hast delivered my soul from the LOWEST hell."

Jonah says, "Out of the belly of hell cried I, and thou heardst my voice." From this it appears evident, that in the days of Jonah and David, the hell into which the wicked were cast, was in *this* world—and we have no account in the Scriptures, of its being transplanted or translated to any other.

Solomon says, Prov. 9: 13—18, "a foolish woman is clamourous; she is simple, and knoweth nothing. For she sitteth at the door of her house, on a seat in the high places of the city, to call passengers who go right on their ways: Whoso is simple, let him turn in hither; and as for him that wanteth understanding, she saith to him, stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant. But he knoweth not the *dead* are there; and that her guests *are in the depths of hell*"!! Here we have an answer to the question at the head of this article. Not only are we told where hell is—the way that leads to it—but we have a description of those who are already in its very depths.—*Ib.*

Religion of the Poggys or the inhabitants of the Nassau Islands.—The religion of this people, if it can be said that they have any, may truly be called the religion of nature. A belief in the existence of some powers more than human, can hardly fail to be excited in the ignorant mind, from the observations of various striking natural phenomena, such as the diurnal revolutions of the sun and moon, thunder and lightning, earthquakes, &c. &c., nor will there ever be wanting among them some of superior talents and cunning, who will acquire influence over weak minds, by assuming to themselves an interest with, or a power of propitiating, those fancied superhuman agents. Such notions constitue the religion of the inhabitants of the Poggys. Sometimes a fowl, and sometimes a hog is sacriffced to avert sickness, to appease the wrath of the imaginary offended power, or to render it propitious to some projected enterprize; but they have no form of religious worship, nor do they appear to have the most distant idea of a future state of rewards and punishments, nor even the existence of a soul distinct from the body, leaving its immortality out of the question.

BEGGING.—A new species of begging is at present in practice in some parts of Germany. Fellows post themselves in the highway with pistols in their hands, and swear to take away, not the life of the passenger, but their own, if they are not relieved. These individuals might perhaps be a good deal puzzled if allowed to put their ther threats into execution.

God has engraved Universalism in living characters on the broad book of nature. Its glowing pages, tell of nought, but power, wisdom, and loving kindness. The host of heaven shine alike on all and earth sends forth her fruits and flowers for all, equally and alike. And shall man—vain, weak, presumptuous man, dare to question these immutable arguments in favour of the unlimited, impartial goodness of the Almighty?—*Gospel Herald.*

GOING TO CHURCH.— A person who goes regularly to church, says Dr. Buchanan, will be well spoken of, if he has no other merit to recommend him—he who neglects that duty, is ill spoken of, if he has no other fault and every other virtue.

"It is upon the mechanical, the agricultural, manufacturing, and labouring classes of society that the liberties of the people depend. it is they who fight our battles, secure our entire independence of foreign nations, and why, let me ask, should they not be entitled to the right of *free and independent suffrage.*"—*De Witt Clinton.*

When our orthodox brethren are angry they act like their God—curse and damn others to hell! Is such conduct worthy of imitation—If not, why do they ascribe it to their Deity?

Poetick Department.

THE INDIAN WITH HIS DEAD CHILD.*

BY MRS. HEMANS.

Then the hunter turned away from that scene,
Where the home of his fathers once had been,
And burning thoughts flashed o'er the mind,
Of the white man's faith and love unkind
BRYANT.

In the silence of the midnight,
I journey with the dead;
In the darkness of the forest boughs,
A lonely path I tread.

But my heart is high and fearless,
As by mighty wings upborne;
The mountain eagle hath not plumes
So strong as love and scorn.

I have raised thee from the grave sod,
By the white man's path defiled;
On to th' ancestral wilderness
I bear thy dust, my child!

I have asked the ancient deserts,
To give my dead a place;
Where the stately footsteps of the free
Alone would leave a trace;

And the rocking pines make answer—
Go, bring us back thine own!
And the streams from all the hunter's hills,
Rushed with an echoing tone.

Thou shalt rest by sounding waters,
That yet untamed may roll:
The voices of those chainless ones
With joy shall fill thy soul.

In the silence of the midnight,
I journey with the dead;
When the arrows of my father's bow,
Their falcon-flight have sped.

I have left the spoiler's dwellings
For evermore behind;
Unmingled with their household sounds,
For me shall weep the Wind.

Alone, amidst their hearth fires,
I watch'd my child's decay;
Uncheer'd I saw the spirit light
From his young eyes fade away.

When his head sank on my bosom,
When the death sleep o'er him fell,
Was there one to say—"A friend is near!"
There was none!—pale race, farewell!

To the forest, to the cedars,
To the warriour and his bow,
Back, Back! I bore thee laughing thence,
—I bear thee slumbering now.

I bear him unto burial,
Where the mighty hunter's gone;
I shall hear thee in the forest breeze,—
Thou wilt speak of joy, my son!

In the silence of the midnight,
I journey with the dead;
But, my heart is strong, my step is fleet,
My father's path I tread.

*"A striking display of Indian character occurred some years since in a town in Maine. An Indian of the Kennebec tribe, remarkable for his good conduct, received a grant of land from the state, and fixed himself in a new township, where a number of families were settled. Though not ill treated, yet the common prejudice against Indians prevented any sympathy with him. This was shown on the death of his only child when none of the people came near him. Shortly after he gave up his farm, dug up the body of his child, and carried it with him two hundred miles thro' the forest, to join the Canadian Indians."—*Tudor's Letters on the Eastern States of America.*

GOD IS GOOD.

God is good! Each perfumed flower,
The smiling fields, the dark green wood,
The insect, fluttering for an hour,—
All things proclaim that God is good.

The Genesee Association of Universalists will assemble at Le Roy Genesee Co., on the fourth Wednesday and following Thursday, in September ensuing.

The Cayuga Association of Universalists will meet at Auburn, Cayuga Co. on the first Wednesday and following Thursday in October next. It is hoped there will be a full attendance. Our Societies will recollect to send delegates, and our brother preachers from other associations are respectfully invited to attend.

O. A. BROWNSON, *Clerk.*

OBITUARY.

Died of consumption, on the 5th inst. in the town of Senate, Cayuga County, New-York, Mrs. MEHITTIBAL JINKS, consort of Mr. Adam Jinks, in the 63d year of her age. Mrs. Jinks had long remained a firm and unshaken believer in the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, under the soul-cheering influence of which belief, she bore with christian patience and resignation to the Divine will, the pain and grief occasioned by a lingering illness which continued more than two years, and terminated in her dissolution. She retained the full exercise of her mental faculties till the last, and manifested in the strongest terms her full confidence in the unchanging benevolence of that God whose *name* and whose *nature is love;* and when she had made all necessary arrangements, she joyfully and without an unpleasant symptom yielded up her spirit to that God who gave it, and fell asleep in the arms of death. While she lived she needed only to be known to be beloved and esteemed. She has left an aged and disconsolate partner, one affectionate son, and a number of daughters, with a large circle of friends to mourn her departure. Thus it appears in this instance that those enlarged and exalted views of the character, attributes and perfections of the Deity, which views are entertained by all *real* Universalists, will not only through life produce righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, but it yields the most pleasing and animating consolations on a dying hour of which the mind of man is capable.

The funeral was attended on the 6th, and a discourse delivered upon the occasion by the writer of the above, to a respectable congregation, where appearance indicated the strong sympathy which they felt in the distress which this dispensation of Divine Providence has given rise to. Text, 1 Cor. xv. 26—"The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." J. CHASE, Jr.

Marcellus, August 10, 1829.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator, is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1829. [NO. 19.

THE PREACHER.

"Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine."

A SERMON.

ON THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGION ON PROSPERITY.

*By O. A. Brownson.**

"He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."—Psalms i. 3.

The kindly influence of religion on the heart and condition of man has, by most men, in all countries, and in all ages of the world, been received and generally acknowledged. But religion has been chiefly confined to the *shades* of life. Mankind are willing to receive her as a *comforter*—to call in her assistance on any occasion of deep distress, or when suffering under some great and unexpected calamity. But it is not only in the dark and adverse parts of a man's life that religion is useful; she is no less salutary in the hour of prosperity, than in the day of adversity.

Those who would confine her influence to the gloom of disappointment or to the melancholy of old age, greatly mistake her nature.—She is indeed useful in such seasons, and without her assistance, we should find it extremely difficult to bear up against the many painful sensations, that then unite to overwhelm us.—But to those who are acquainted with her character—to those, whose hearts have felt her warm invigorating touch, she will ever be a welcome companion. They will seek her when the sun is clouded—wish her to cheer the evening of life; but will wish her no less—will find her powers no weaker, in the morning of prosperity.

And then she puts on her lovelier charms and appears in her more engaging dress. Imagination cannot present a more pleasing object than the youth animated by the pure emotions of genuine religion—than the man smiling with prosperity, obedient to her calls and faithful in the discharge of her offices. "He is like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."

A more lively and beautiful figure, to represent his prosperity, could not have been selected from the whole compass of nature, than the one chosen by the Psalmist in our text. A tree is an object of beauty. Few things in nature can awaken more pleasing emotions in the bosom. To see one stand on a barren heath with short and shrubbed branches and withered leaves is, I confess, calculated to depress our feelings, and overwhelm us with melancholy reflections. But to see one growing beside the running stream, that moistens its roots and replenishes the soil—to behold it bearing its "fruit in its season," giving fragrance, beauty and shade to the surrounding scenery, will fill with admiration every lover of nature. Add the evergreen leaf with the assurance it "shall not wither," and you have a picture on which you may gaze with emotions of delight and tranquility.

To point out the man that is likened unto this tree, and show the increase of his prosperity, is the design of this discourse.

The Psalmist has assisted us in the first part of this inquiry. He begins by informing us he is blessed; "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Such a one, we are informed in our text, "shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water." &c.—He is one then, we may say, who has withdrawn himself from ungodliness—has not mingled with the vicious multitude, nor joined with scoffers—one who studies the law of God, carefully inquires his duty, cultivates the warm and generous emotions of religion, feels them in his heart, and acknowledges them in his conduct; one we may suppose who has enlarged his mind, expanded his heart with benevolence, learned "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God;" one whose hands are clean, whose intentions pure, whose con-

*I re-publish the following sermon, more from a boyish partiality than from my conviction of its worth. It was my first essay in print, and when this was published in 1826, the writer little thought within three years, he should be branded heretick, infidel and even Atheist by his own friends. The curious may compare it with my present sentiments. For though this sermon is greatly indebted to Dr. Blair, it contains the views with which I entered the ministry, and the mild practical course I would gladly have continued had not the circumstances of the age compelled me to assume a more energetick, and in some instances, a more controversial aspect. The discourse smacks too much of orthodox phrase to suit my present taste, but its lessons cannot be too often repeated.

science void of offence, who listens with interest to the calls of humanity, commiserates the calamities of his brethren, studies to remove the load of common misery, and to enable all to smile beneath the gracious bounty of our heavenly Father.

He is one who has subdued his desires for unlawful pleasures, weaned his affections from things of this world, and placed them on things above.* One who puts his trust in God, rests all his hopes of happiness on the will of his Father, pays his early vows in the sanctuary, rejoices to come before the Lord, and bow himself before the high God. And, to sum up his character in a word, he is one who avoids vice and vicious companions, loves virtue, reverences religion, and is kind, generous and humane in all his intercourse with his brethren. Such is the man who is religious—such is the man that shall stand beside the rivers of water, yield his fruit in his season, whose leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.

Let us turn to consider the increase of his prosperity, and to show in what manner he is more prosperous than the irreligious or bad man.

1. Prosperity is increased to him because religion has prepared his mind for enjoyment.—If we look into the heart of the bad man, we shall find it filled with a multitude of rough and discordant principles, which are continually raging and opposing each other. We shall see inordinate love of wealth, unreasonable ambition for greatness, a burning thirst for unlawful pleasures and sensual gratification. These are increased by appetite, strengthened by indulgence, and confirmed by habit. Their demands are loud and imperious. Their objects different, and often contradictory. The man is compelled to follow each, which must be done at the expense of its rival. Thus it happens, the satisfaction gained by the gratification of one favorite passion, is generally lost in the disappointment it occasions another. A thousand desires are constantly springing in his bosom, so equally balanced in their weight, so nearly powerful in their strength, that he no sooner decides to follow one, than his purpose is shaken, and he is drawn back by another. Hence he lives in constant turmoil and perplexity.—Hence his mind in a state of perpetual fluctuation, hangs vacillating between these imperious masters; all of which he wishes to obey, but their variety and discordance is such, that he seldom yields obedience to any. Or grant some one, more powerful than the rest, has gained the ascendency, and reduced the others to submission—a thousand obstacles intervene, which delay or embitter its gratification.

We grant the man wealth; we grant his external condition may appear flourishing; his houses and lands may increase; his fields yield the plenteous harvest. But something is wanting still to complete that plenitude of felicity he desires. His mind, yea his heart has become attached to his possessions. A mean, sordid, avaricious disposition, frequently characteristic of wealth, renders him incapable of happiness, deadens all the finer feelings, cools all the warm emotions of the heart, closes all the small springs of pleasure, which excite and spread joy and delight through the bosom of the good man.

Or is he bent on worldly applause? Every lisp of censure carries dejection to his soul, and fills him with the most painful sensations. But the good man having subdued these vain desires, hears unmoved the praise or scorn of the world. Conscious of the rectitude of his own heart, and the purity of his intentions, all within is calm, and heaven will take care of that which is without.

Still further, the bad man has a never-failing source of uneasiness and deep regret in the improper means he has used to gratify his appetites and passions. The cries of the injured orphan, the complaints of the oppressed widow, haunt his sleeping and waking hours! Bleeding innocence torn from the bosom of her parents, from the society of her friends, rifled of her charms, ruined, left to bleech in the tempest of fortune, strikes daggers to his soul! Conscience tells him his guilt is great—his condemnation is sealed. Trembling at the account she reads, horror presents him before the bar of his God. His own heart condemns him—God is greater than his heart! Struck aghast at the picture, sleep becomes a stranger, "food insipid, society wearisome, pleasure disgusting, and life itself a cruel bitter."

But the good man having ever aimed well, trusts the mercy of his God for the pardon of those offences which through the weakness of his nature he may have committed. His past life brings to his mind no instance of cruelty or deception; no enormous crime or act of injustice. He delights to call up the hours that have gone by. He can view them with a placid serenity. He looks around on the present with pleasing tranquility, and forward with confidence and hope.

2. Prosperity is increased to a good man because he is free from all the terrifying apprehensions of unseen calamities and impending ruin. The bad man has no source of happiness but the world. All his dependence is placed on the goods of fortune; his wealth, his pleasures, his family, or friends. Little experience is sufficient to convince those of the least discernment that these are not durable goods. "Riches take to themselves wings and fly away." The elements often bursting their rage with resistless fury, in one moment bear with

* The expression, this world should be restricted to the vain things of the Jewish age, or if applied at this day, to the pleasures of sense, in opposition to those above, or to the more noble things of the Gospel, which is righteousness.—Ed.

them the labors of years, and leave him destitute. Fame's shrill clarion may sound his achievements, proclaim the multitude of his friends and pleasures; competition may slink to the caverns of envy, and slander to the shades of night. Yet the sun of prosperity will grow weary of gilding the habitation of uninterrupted repose; the clouds of sorrow will arise, the tempest of adversity gather round, and the thunder of disappointment burst upon him.—His friends will leave him, his name be enrolled on the black list of infamy, or crowded away with the thousands that are,—die and are forgotten?

These are ordinary occurrences. These fill his mind with dreadful apprehensions, and the most gloomy forebodings. In the absence of *real*, he adopts *imaginary* ills, and mourns over anticipated woe, as though he actually felt its direful hand. But the good man having cultivated his mind, acquired habits of virtue, has a source of happiness independent of his external condition. He has a fund within himself—a permanent fund, whence he can continually draw fresh pleasures. He has learned all sublunary things are evanescent. He expects they will leave him. He guards against their flight; but prepares himself to meet, unmoved, the shock. But should they leave him, he is not destitute; his peace of mind remains. That rests on the rectitude of his heart, the purity of his intentions, the consciousness that he has ever discharged his duty, and been faithful over those things which are placed under his care. This source of happiness no change of fortune can destroy. It remains the same whether she smiles or frowns, and this being the source of his greatest and chief happiness, he can dread no attack from without, fear no approaching calamity or impending ruin. He trusts in his God. "He shall hide him in his pavillion, in the secret of his tabernacle shall he hide him, he shall place him upon a rock." Hence, secure from all imaginary ills, from all forebodings of future woe, he can enjoy his prosperity with cheerfulness and tranquility.

3. But prosperity is still farther increased to the good man by the generous manner in which he uses it. Reason and religion both assert the fact that every thing is good and proper in itself considered, that the only evil there is in any thing is the improper manner in which it may be used. Hence the bad man by the improper use he makes of his prosperity, converts it into adversity. He allows it to corrupt his temper, to debase his mind, produce a feverish and sickly appetite; to enervate the nobler faculties of his soul, harden his heart, blind his eyes and deafen his ears to the complaints, sufferings and wretched condition of those around him; to generate that frame of mind which becomes confident of its own importance and superiority; proud and haughty looks with contempt on others, and secures their hatred and detestation. He hears no one proclaim his benedictions; sees no one happy through his munificence; has no consoling reflection that he has studied to lighten the load of common misery; receives the kind embrace of no worthy, virtuous and affectionate friend. The behaviour of all with whom he associates is characterised by cold civility, or disgusting obsequiousness. Hence he languishes in the midst of his studied refinement and vast possessions, envied and envying, unloving and unbeloved.

But on the other hand, mark the good man. Religion has softened his heart, and rendered him feelingly alive to the wants and distresses of others. He has not possessed wealth for himself alone, he has made it a common blessing. He has compassionated the sufferings of the wretched; his presence has gladdened the lonely cottage; his bounty has rescued the hungry soul from death. He sees a happy land smiling with content, made so by his benefactions. The blessing has returned upon his own head; and the secret delight of benevolence and gratitude, has fully demonstrated the fact, "it is more blessed to give than receive!" He can adopt the language of the once prosperous Job: "When the ear heard me then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me it gave witness to me, because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me, and I caused the widows' heart to sing for joy. I put on righteousness and it clothed me; my judgement was as a robe and a diamond. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the poor; and the cause which I knew not I searched out. My root was spread out by the waters, and the dew lay all night upon my branch. My glory was fresh within me, and my bow was renewed in my hand."

4. But lastly, prosperity is increased to the good man from the happy prospect he has in his children. The greatest and chief concern of a man's life is his children. To provide for them, to see them walk in the paths of usefulness, fill places of honor and respectability, constitutes a large proportion of the felicity allotted his pilgrimage journey of life. While the bad man has been engrossed in the cares of the world, neglecting the education of his children, vainly thinking to ensue their felicity by worldly splendour, the good man has been faithfully cultivating the minds of his, suppressing their evil propensities, drawing out the latent virtues of their nature, and with "pious care," endeavoring to form them to all that is truly great or good in man. While the bad man has the mortification to see his children grow up with all their natural propensities, unrestrained appetites and passions strengthened by his own indulgence and confirmed by his own practices: while he sees them plunge into excess, sink in the vortex of dissipation, rove in folly and inconsisten-

cy, or fall before the tribunals of justice, the good man sees his grow up in the ways of virtue, walk the paths of wisdom, sing in the bowers of understanding, or ramble over the flowery lawns of religion; sees them shine with lovely graces, endeared by a peculiar sweetness of temper to their parents, attracting the esteem of their acquaintance and the friendship of all who know them. Early impressed with filial piety, they remember him, and do not forsake him in his old age; but study to make his decline of life smooth and easy. Hence "his leaf also shall not wither." He sees his children green, they do not wither away with evil or vicious companions; dissipation does not blast their verdure: and even the storms of the winter of life cannot destroy their freshness.—They bud in his bosom in this terrestrial soil, but they shall bloom with unfading glory in the bosom of his heavenly Father in the regions above. Hence the influence of religion on prosperity, hence the superiority of the good man over the bad; a mind free from perturbation, guilt, or remorse, firmly relying on his God, believing his pardon sufficient for the past, praising him for the present, and trusting him for the future—a heart susceptible of the highest felicity rendered supremely happy in himself in the love and gratitude of others in the good conduct and bright and brightening prospects of his children. "His wife is a fruitful vine by the sides of his house, his children like olive plants round about his table."

Such is the influence of religion on the prosperous, and such I presume is the desire of each of my respected auditors. Cultivate then, suffer me to entreat you, the benevolent affections of the heart, acquire habits of virtue, place your dependence on God, keep his commandments, retreat from vice and the company of the ungodly, and this prosperity shall be yours; you "shall be like trees planted beside the rivers of water, that bear their fruit in the season, and whatsoever you do shall prosper."

THE ESSAYIST.

AN ESSAY ON DIVINE GOODNESS.

NO. V.

This has been delayed on account of a press of other matter though perhaps not more interesting, at least from its character demanded a more immediate insertion.

The question now to be answered is an important one. Is there more good than evil in the world? The dreams of the Optimist are fascinating, they serve to beguile many a weary hour of its tediousness. But they are dreams. So far as this world is concerned there is evil, evil absolute and often insupportable. Why it was introduced into this system man does not, cannot, know, how it exists, how it prevails, he may know, and by what means it can be removed or lessoned, he ought to know, and must know, before he can be happy.

Is there more good than evil in the world? The question is not easily answered. Who can measure all the painful emotions ever felt? Who can measure the pleasurable ones? Till this is done we must remain ignorant of the true answer. Let the question be varied. Is the world so constituted that man *may* enjoy more happiness than he suffers of evil? This is in fact, the important question. This looks back only for instruction, while it looks forward to a more blissful station, and points out the way by which it may be obtained.

Evil has originated in our imperfection, it is preserved by the ignorance of mankind, and experience proves it may be destroyed by duly enlightening the mind. Knowledge will dissipate the clouds of sorrow, dispel the shades of misery and light the human race to the fountain of felicity. If this be true man may be more happy than he is miserable: and if this is made to appear, we may pronounce the Creator of the world good in creating it. This is as far as we can go. Nature will never prove the unbounded goodness of God. A survey of nature will prove he is rather good than evil, and we must leave it to revelation to prove the extent of his goodness.

To ascertain whether knowledge will make our condition better than it is, let us look again at existing evils. The evils, termed physical, are few and are not of the most grievous kind. The noxious effluvia of swamps, of stagnant waters, cause diseases, decaying animal and vegetable substances, poison the air, infect the lungs, produce sickness and pain. But these swamps may be drained. The hand of industry may remove the stagnant pool, and art may guard against the diseases occasioned by the decaying substances mentioned.

We speak of sickness, of colds and fevers. But these are not always owing to the changes of the atmosphere, nor to the poisonous effluvia floating in the air. They often arise from undue exposures, from excessive labour, from unwholesome diet, and from more mental agitation. In a well regulated state of society, these exposures, these excessive exertions, might be avoided. Experience might determine the most wholesome food, and by secureing to active industry its just reward, there would be no necessity of eating that which is unwholesome. In a well regulated state of society the wants of all might be satisfied with a moderate share of labour, the wants too, might be much circumscribed. Hence that painful anxiety of mind, which often ruins the body as well as itself, would not be felt, cheerfulness would always be preserved and with it health.

Sickness is also occasioned by indulgence, by indolence which destroys the activity of both mind and body, and generates disease, or disposes the body to receive it. Intemperance, in eating or in drinking, vitiate the stomach, deranges the whole system and hasten dissolution. But these may be avoided. Not indeed,

by merely preaching against them. We may declaim against vice eternally, and be eternally vicious. But by substituting an innocent gratification for a destructive indulgence.—Give the mind some employment, in which it can take interest, or let the hands be engaged in some task which is honorable and useful.—Let both mind and body be exercised and these indulgences will become less and less frequent until they finally disappear.

There is one fruitful source of vice, of misery. It is the wrong estimation we make of things. It is the misfortune of the world to prize things in an inverse ratio to their real worth. The most useful profession is deemed the least respectable, and the most worthless, the most honourable. The badge of labour, of useful labour, which should be the badge of merit, of distinction, of honour, is, by the strange perversity of men's taste, the badge of degradation. The bloated Aristocrat in his hall of laziness or of vicious indulgence, who disdains any useful labour and would think himself degraded by being beneficial, this bloated, worthless wretch, looks with contempt upon the humble mechanic or the industrious agriculturalist.

This makes those who are of the lower class, as it is improperly and cruelly named, impatient of their situation, makes them loathe their labour, anxious to be idle and useless that they may be respectable. This not only leads to crime in the poor classes, but leads to that idleness and listlessness which are the chief causes of that indulgence, that pride and those practices which degrade and destroy the more wealthy and oppulent. Having no employment, or unable to employ themselves in any useful occupation, they wear out their lives in immoderate eating, drinking, or some kind of intemperance, which would have been avoided had they deemed it not only innocent but honourable to cultivate a garden, a farm, to pursue a mechanical profession, or had they obtained a relish for knowledge and been prepared to feast the mind with its fruits. Proper instruction would correct many of these wrong habits of mind, would give more beneficial instructions. With these institutions we might become happy.

Whoever will look on life as he should will admit we have all the materials we need, we only require to be taught how to use them in order to be happy. We can then exonerate Diety from the charge of a want of goodness. The world is a blessing to us, if it be not it is our fault and not the fault of him who made it. We may be happy, and doubtless the time will come when all will enjoy themselves.

We have only to take up revelation, where our reason stops, and add inspirations to experience. Life and immortality are brought to light through the Gospel. We are taught we shall live again, become the inhabitants of another world where all our doubts shall be removed, where the darkness which now encumbers our vision shall be removed, and we enabled to see the goodness of God shine alike resplendant in what we have suffered and in what we have enjoyed.

To a future life I look for the evidences of the unbounded goodness of God. All may finally terminate in good and the remembrance of our pain may enhance our bliss. As we have discovered we may improve our condition, let us attempt it and wait patiently for the full revelation of that which can be but darkly seen in this world of existence. My Essay is closed. O. A. B.

THE MISSION OF CHRIST.

The following article is occasioned by some remarks of a correspondent. The editor has said less on the doctrinal parts of the Gospel than his readers might desire—less than he intended; for it was his design to have thrown in all he had to say on that subject, under the general head of "Essay on Christianity."—That design is not relinquished, but will assume a different medium than a periodical to gain publicity. Hereafter, we shall treat the several detached parts of the Gospel as occasion may require.

The man, who despises his own reflections, who cramps his mind by blind obedience to the *dicta* of others, is as unfit to write for the instruction of others, as he is destitute of any rational sentiments of his own. Opinions should be *formed*, not *borrowed*; and as it may be presumed that, what every man is required to believe, is within his reach, every one should not only exercise his powers, but he should learn to place the chief dependence on himself, and trust to his mental energies for the acquisition of truth.

Religion, if true, is a thing in which all are equally interested. It ought to be equally adapted to the capacity of each individual.—Whatever requires a mental power not common to all, or whatever requires a degree of research and laborious investigation, which every man may not pursue, consistently with his duty to himself and to society, or that which must make the many dependent on the few, making it the duty of a certain privileged class to explain, and the great body to yield therefore a blind assent, is no part of a rational religion, and by those who reflect, it must be for ever rejected.

Religion is supposed to include faith or belief. Faith is the result of evidence, or of that which the mind deems such. Every man is required to believe, the evidences should therefore extend to all, and be equally within the comprehension of each individual. Man is a creature of numerous wants; he must labour

to satisfy these; he must support himself and those who are dependent upon him. This must necessarily include a large portion of his time, and prevent him from turning over all the legends of antiquity, and of sifting the truth from the falsehood. True religion cannot require him to become acquainted with those evidences which it must occupy his whole life to learn. This would be charging Providence with a want of care in adjusting the balance of our duties. Nor can it be any better to hire a certain class to think and examine for us. This class may think more of their own interest than of truth, and a good living may seem the most agreeable fact to examine.—Hence the great body of the people would be as liable to be deceived and to believe wrong as right.

The mission of Christ, according to the above reasoning, must be plain, within the capacity of all, so plain that he who runs may read, and the way-faring man, though a fool, may understand; it must be understood by all it was designed to bless, and the evidences of its truth should be such as the most stupid can comprehend, and the most sceptical acknowledge convincing. In this mission we must discover an object to be obtained, and we must see the means adequate to the end proposed.

The first thing to ascertain is, what is this object, what is the end proposed by the mission of Christ? A difficult question to answer, not from its own nature, but from the obscurity in which ignorance or fraud has involved it.—There is no need of running over a refutation of false opinions. No man who understands the nature of moral justice, will admit God transferred our sins to Christ, and cursed his son for that of which he was not guilty, nor will any one who thinks, be more ready to admit the righteousness of Christ will answer for us in the sight of God, while we remain unrighteous ourselves. The very notion begins with a falsehood; it proceeds with cruelty, and ends as it begun in—a lie. God being always gracious, needed no sacrifice to appease his anger, or to dispose him to be merciful—and as the murder of an innocent person can never be very satisfactory to justice, all ideas of a vicarious atonement or of expiatory sufferings must be excluded from the mission of Christ.

The object may be soon stated: The world was sinful—man was disobedient, ignorant, alienated from God—in a word, unrighteous. Though he was in this situation, God still loved him, and in this situation God commended his love to them that "Christ died for the ungodly." The mission was not to reconcile God; for God loved us. But did we love God? No; we needed a change; and as we were unrighteous, the object of Christ's mission was to make us righteous. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." "Him hath God raised up to bless every one of you by turning you *away* from your *iniquities*."

We consider the object of Christ in his mission was simply to reform mankind, not by any supernatural means, but by a simple operation, differing in degree, but not in kind, from the labours of every reformer. I am perfectly aware that most christians will think I degrade the works of the Saviour; that the mission of Christ represented as being so grand and so august, is thus dwindled down to comparatively nothing. Right or wrong, this is all that universalists and unitarians allow, when their language is properly simplified, and all that can be supported from the Gospel, when stript of the pomp of custom, metaphor, which, to us, tends to destroy the simplicity of the christian scheme.

It should be borne in mind, that Jesus of Nazareth, was one of those benevolent individuals who are far in advance of the age in which they appear. The true nature of his mission was but imperfectly understood by his immediate disciples, and the succeeding age, who incorporated, or more in accordance with general belief, began to incorporate, with his precepts, the pompous absurdities of prevailing systems of religion and philosophy, soon lost sight of their teacher, and retained nothing more of the Jewish Reformer than the name. His pretended disciples soon raised him from a man to an angel, from that to a demi-god, and at length to a god. Thus deified, he must have a work equal in magnitude to his supposed majesty. Hence patching up or rather filling up the mountains of Jewish and Gentile fables, they imagined he came to do what there never was to be done. Throwing aside every thing of this character, passing over the fables, wonders and prodigies, which ignorance and superstition ascribed to him, taking the outlines of his character as drawn by the four Evangelists, we may pretty satisfactorily ascertain what he enjoined, and what was the object he proposed to himself.

The Jews had a vague conception of some personage which should arise to deliver their nation, and to raise it to the height of human glory. They called him "Messiah," that is, the *anointed* or a person commissioned, or, if you please, consecrated to a certain work.—Whether Jesus of Nazareth was the person they expected, is nothing, neither one way or the other. The fact seems that he either assumed the character, or the appellation Messiah, was attributed to him, whether for the purpose of attracting the attention of the Jews, does not readily appear.

The orientals, particularly the Magi, had, by their astrological calculations and representations, inculcated a belief that a great personage, the Son, the Angel of Light, should appear to destroy the works of Akriman, (the Devil,) to *regenerate* the world, and to intro-

duce the reign of Light, or the reign of good. This notion became incorporated with the Jewish, and from the union of the two with some beautiful unintelligibilities from the Platonick school, has been formed the absurd system of religion, known in the world for the last fifteen hundred years as the christian, in which scarcely a particle of christianity can be found.

The careful enquirer will perceive, and the philosopher, perhaps, be amused to examine, the struggle of the Jewish and Persian prophets; but the Persian has triumphed, and the Ebionites, the Nazarines, the primitive followers, the most orthodox, are finally placed on the list of hereticks, and consigned over to damnation. The Gnosticks have perished in name, but their system, with a loss of a few of its ears, and by the acquisition of a little Jewish phraseology, and a little pagan idolatry, has prevailed, and forms the basis of the religion most admired by christendom.

Abating from the doctrine of Christ what is borrowed from these sources, with a spirit of philosophical discernment, we may perceive Christ simply as a reformer, labouring to reform the abuses of his countrymen, to root out their prejudices, to *humanize* their minds, destroy their bigotry and intolerance, and to give them more enlarged views of God and of man. This will appear the object of his mission. To accomplish this, he laboured with a zeal and perseverance worthy our imitation. But the doctrines he taught, the freedom of his strictures, and sometimes the severity of his censures, drew down upon his head the rage of the rich, the proud, the bigoted and the powerful. Unarmed, he could not stand the shock—he lost his life.

This object is still further enlarged, when we take into view his doctrine; but even then his mission will be confined to mankind. Its object was to produce righteousness, to reform the world, to make the numerous family of man holy and happy. Was this a small object? Was this unworthy the Nazarine reformer? To us it appears the most noble, the most magnificent, and the most desirable object, which man can conceive. For this the philanthropist may labour with the warmest zeal, and for this he may well lay down his life.

But is this all we are to expect from the Gospel? In one view, it is *more* than we can expect; in another view it is but an item.—The Gospel has *not* reformed the whole world: and if the only salvation spoken of in the bible was a salvation limited to this life, universal salvation were indeed a dream. But there is another view of this subject: The *doctrine* Christ taught has relation to another world as well as this. This doctrine raises our hopes, and will give us eternal life. But Christ did not make this doctrine—he only taught it; his death did not make it true—it only served as a seal to its truth. This doctrine he received from God; it is the doctrine of life and immortality, brought *to light* through the Gospel, not made true by it. The Gospel is nothing but its promulgation, and the doctrine must have been true before its promulgation, or else when proclaimed it must have been false. It is in this *doctrine*, not in the person of Jesus, we have hope of immortality. But as this was testified by the death and resurrection of Christ, it is therefore said, we have "hope in his death."—[*To be continued.*]

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

CONSCIENCE.

There is much said of conscience, and there is no little dispute respecting what it is. Some say it is a monitor within, a gift, from heaven, a principle implanted in the bosom of every sincere Christian which dictates right from wrong. But do not sinners feel its benign influence? do they not feel conscious of doing wrong? do they not bear with bitter anguish the heavy load of sin? are they not like the troubled sea, which cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt? Orthodoxy must answer no. However hagard may be the appearance of sin, orthodoxy must deny it is painful to the sinner.

A soul totally depraved, cannot be said to possess the least degree of light; it is so completely blind that it has not the least sense of duty, and nothing like goodness can afford it the least enjoyment. Sin constitutes the whole felicity of a soul thus depraved, and is even rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongue.—This is total depravity. "Heaven to such a soul would be the severest part of hell." For his whole life and joy consists in doing evil. Why then is not hell a place of complete happiness as heaven?

Hell according to received opinion, must be a place exactly fitted to the demon natures of the wicked, and it is the only place in which they can receive any enjoyment. Where then are the much boasted hell-torments? They cannot be inflicted on the righteous, and the totally depraved can have no greater enjoyments, they constitute their heaven.

These views teach us the reprobate have nothing to do with conscience, let us enquire, how far the saints are actuated by its unerring influence. One sect feel it their duty to have a little water sprinkled on their face; another class that the body should be immersed, and others that both modes are unnecessary. Some are very tenacious of a particular day in the week to be set apart for holy purposes, while others esteem all days as alike holy, and believe it proper to do good on any or every day of the week. These with many other contrarieties, daily witnessed, are equally the effects of conscience. All our superstitions, with those of Heathen Idolatry may be traced to the same

cause. Thus far we may learn the effects of conscience while it governs the hearts of the pious.

When the pious govern the *Commons*, conscience becomes a rod of iron. It is then its infuriate zeal is let loose upon all infidels, hereticks and unbelievers; it is then it has no restraint, and all opposed to its peculiar creeds, must be scourged and tortured in a manner degrading to our natures and shocking to humanity. Who can look over the pages of history without the most painful sensations of horrour and regret, when he learns the torrents of blood, the extent of human butchery occasioned by a zeal for, but not according to knowledge, by a form of godliness destitute of its power?

We may also find that conscience dictates to suffer the severest pain as well as to inflict it. Many have allowed themselves to be burned at the stake with lighted faggots placed around their naked bodies or had their flesh consumed over a slow fire; in all the agonies of death they have persisted in their faith, unmoved, rather than to recant their sentiments. Such is the influence of this principle that it is prized more than life, and it leads individuals to glory, in suffering, while the persecutors receive joy unspeakable in hearing the groans and witnessing the anguish of their miserable victims!

Hence has originated the idea that the saints in heaven will rejoice while they see sinners writhing in hell. What a thought! Christian is this the principle of Divine love? Does this principle soften thy heart and cause thee to love thy neighbour as thyself? Thy neighbour —and is none thy neighbour but those who are exactly of thy faith? Read the instructive parable of the man who fell among thieves and blush for thy contracted philanthropy. Learn to imitate the good Samaritan, but beware of the proud and self-sufficient Priest and of the unfeeling Levite.

It may be said these outrages were practised in the dark ages of Popery and ought not be applied to the present state of society. In reply we need only look at the conduct of our leading clergy, and see how far they are behind their predecessors, according to their ability. Give them power and there would be the same spirit to destroy heresy. Is not Infidel, child of the Devil with ten thousand curses denounced against all who do not bow to their images and subscribe to their faith, daily thundering in our ears? do they not manifest a desire to be our rulers both spiritual and temporal? Our Legislators are annually harrassed with their spiritual petitions, and many are bold to declare that our nation can never prosper until our rulers become devout members of the church. Should Church and State be united, what have we to warrant us, the vilest outrages of persecution will not again be committed? Are they more devotedly pious than formerly? It is but a few years since our pious fathers governed the New England States and in them we may draw a true picture of the present church, for that same principle pervades the hearts and govern the actions of the present clergy; that same persecuting spirit now prevails and it is the lack of power that secures our liberties. Conscience may be good but let us beware of those who obey conscience when not directed by just knowledge. MARCUS.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

CHURCH AND STATE.—NO. 6.

The sentiments contained in the extracts from Dr. Ely, inserted in our last, have obtained no small notoriety. When compared with the object stated in the "Circular," we have noticed, little doubt is left as to the real object of the Orthodox. Their intentions become obvious, and their plans are exhibited in bold relief. They propose an amalgamation of the principal religious denominations, from which, it is hoped, will result a "wise national creed." And to maintain this creed, they express themselves desirous of procuring "a portion of the public lands," for the benefit of the clergy. That is in plain English, our orthodox friends wish to fix the support of the clergy upon a solid basis to obtain for them sufficient state patronage to have them paid from the national treasury.

Our government, instead of being a civil institution must become the pillar of the church, and employ its influence and resources in the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline. The government, indeed, is not required to say what religion it will support, but it is to bow to the most numerous and the most influential party. This is evident from the whole tenour of the orthodox logick. They complained of the committee in Senate, because they did not grant the prayer of the petitioners respecting the Sabbath Mail. They blamed the committees, on the ground that the petitioners had the majority of the Republic on their side. Hence on their ground, when the majority of the people ask government to aid their religion, government must do it.

We as not, say the people, government to decide what religion we shall have, but to protect the religion which we have. Protect the religion of the minority? No. But the religion which the majority have said they will have. Hence it is plain to what class of the clergy, the public funds must be appropriated; not to all, but to a limited, yet sufficient number of the orthodox, and that sect may be considered orthodox who have the greatest numerical force. On this ground, the authors of the "Circular" would have religion established, and by so doing, "all opposition from *infidelity* would be borne down and overpowered."

No doubt such an object may seem very desirable to some, but to those who may chance to be of the minority, it may not seem worthy of all praise. But how is it to be accomplished? Our Government, say those religionists, is bound to obey the will of its constituents, that is the will of the majority. Governments like

ours can be moulded with perfect ease, when the people are rightly instructed and are properly marshalled to the work. The majority of the people may say "we will have such a religion," no one can prohibit them. They may say they will have a certain sum paid to the preachers of that religion, and the national treasury must pay it—the people are sovereigns. Only one thing is wanting, that is to have those who manage the government, prepare to adopt the measures. Now for Dr. Ely's plan.

"I propose fellow citizens a new party in politicks—a Christian party." What is this for? Reader canst thou not perceive? Know then the orthodox want the Government to aid them, to patronise their plans and to give them the publick lands. Infidels would not do this. It is therefore necessary to have none but *Christians* elected to any office, yea more, none but orthodox Christians, who are ready to aid the orthodox clergy in the support of their party. We will have a Christian party in politicks; we will elect none but of a certain faith, and those we elect must understand we elect them for the promotion of our religion. They must know their duty is to aid our plans as a sort of compromise for their election.

Such is the plan. Americans, when you submit to this, when you ask a religious *profession* of your representatives, your legislators, judges and other officers, you may expect Salem witch-craft to return, and the period of hanging Quakers and banishing Baptists will again come round. You may think this day is far distant. Be it so. But God in mercy avert it from our children, and grant the Beast, which preyed upon our ancestors, may not live to devour our children.

While on this subject, the memory of the past rises, crowded with mournful images—pictures appalling to less sensative hearts than ours, strike the vision; a warning voice from other days, comes on each breeze. Sad as the funeral dirge, sighing through the cypress grove, it bids us "beware." The hallowed name of religion may become the pass-word to death, and the zeal, which the profession of piety consecrates, may be fed with unholy fires, and burn to the lowest hell.—Cold is the heart that does not love the Great Author of nature, unfeeling and unrefined is the sensibility that does not receive its highest bliss at the Altar of the Most High; but colder still and more dead to feeling the one which can even contemplate, without "trembling alive all o'er," the return of priestly ignorance and clerical misrule. The clergy have reigned. They, have, seated upon the thrones of the Ceasars, made their power felt far beyond the farthest limits of the Roman name. And then "darkness was visible," relieved only by the fires which lit the victims to their tomb. Is that period to return? Is that gloom to be spread over our sun lighted land? It may be so.

But why declaim? Why call up the melancholly picture of other times? Why weep over the woes endured by generations gone? Whoever knew priestcraft softened with tears, or mellowed by visions of sorrow? Priestcraft! offspring of hell! relentless as death, all devouring as the grave, with an imagined warrant from God stalks forth with the spirit of the devil, and spares neither age, sex nor condition; neither vice nor virtue, nor aught good or bad, dear to the heart or indifferent, that may grapple with its plans of universal dominion. If defeated—it sits like Marius on the ruins of Carthage, smiling in scorn, writhing its lips with revenge and planning new scenes of murder and devastation. If successful, it breathes with the withering sirroc and fattens on the sighs, tears and woes of its enslaved victims. A heartless monster! hoping to reach Heaven by filling up mountains of wretchedness, or if doomed to hell, anxious to involve a universe in its ruin. But enough. It was in honour of this monster Dr. Ely preached his sermon, and it is for this, their God, the orthodox clergy are labouring, and at his shrine they pay their morning and evening devotions. Deluded wretches, let them worship on, but God forbid any more should be seduced to join in their unholy worship!

We need look no further. Dr. Ely has exhibited the plan. He has told us for whom we must vote and he has declared it his anxious desire to form a party, which shall obey the directions he has given. That party is forming; his principles are being reduced to practice, and who can tell the results? Do they lack power? Our future numbers will consider this enquiry. Sabbath Schools must pass in review, and we shall glance at the Mammoth Bible Society, and other misnamed benevolent institutions, and ask, how large are their funds? How fast are they increasing? Who has the control of these funds? and what warrant have we that these funds will be judiciously managed and properly expended? Reader, turn not idly from this subject, Man may "steal the livery of the Court of Heaven to serve the Devil in."—EDITOR.

WEAKNESS.

A Friend in Chilacothe who was allowed by Mr. Rains to read the Advocate, by taking it out of the office and paying the postage, has requested us to discontinue sending the paper.—The reason assigned is, that his faith is so *weak* that he seems afraid the Advocate will destroy what little he has, and as he derives all his happiness from this *weak* faith he is very much shocked with the idea of losing it. No wonder. We of course stop the paper, for not expecting any *pay* for it, there is no great profit to us in sending it.

What our friend's faith is, which he dreads to lose, and which he fears he shall, if he continues to read our paper, he has not informed us, and we do not care; but one thing we are certain, he loves that faith more than he does truth, or else he would not fear to examine it.

Alas! There are a great many like him, we pity them, would enlighten them, but find ourselves obliged to let them sink into the grave with all their folly, and God grant they may leave none of it behind.

The same friend seems troubled to understand "how a professed preacher of the Gospel can be an admirer of Miss Frances Wright, and

make quotations from her infidel writings."—Now it so happens we have never proclaimed ourself an admirer of Frances Wright. We have aimed to be just to merit, and to lend our influence to rescue a benevolent female from undeserved abuse. We claim no praise for this, and when we learn it is inconsistent for a Gospel minister to speak in behalf of a fellow being, who is devoting herself and fortune to what she believes the good of mankind—when it shall be inconsistent for the Gospel Preacher to speak in behalf of slandered merit and appreciate virtue, then we will lay aside the black coat and seek an asylum far from the haunts of men.

But we have made "quotations from her Infidel writings." We enquire for truth and we care not who assists us to find it. We copied an article from the Free Enquirer, written, we supposed, by the lady in question. If that article be Infidel, be it so, we would to God there were more *such* infidelity in the world.

But Miss Wright is "an enemy to Christ and to his religion." Had our friend read the Free Enquirer, or made himself acquainted with the writings of this lady, he might have spared this accusation. Miss Wright is not engaged in a war with creeds. Her object seems to be the enlightening of mankind, not in respect to another world, but in respect to this. She would elevate the condition of the human race and teach man to practice virtue. Her object is good. Whether she takes the right method to accomplish it, is another thing. We believe her labours will be useful. The subjects she treats are of vital importance to society. Whatever tends to call the publick mind to these subjects, whatever elicits a discussion of these topicks must have a beneficial tendency.

We do despise that mawkish sensibility exhibited by professing Christains. Christianity is either true or it is false, if it is true, it has nothing to fear from free enquiry, if it be false, we ought not to wish to believe it. For ourselves we have no fears on this subject. The greatest part of the last ten years we have devoted to solving the momentous question, is Christianity true? We have satisfied our mind, our faith on that point is fixed, not by tradition but by investigation. We are not conscious of any injury the study has done us, and we believe it would be advantageous if every one would discuss the subject for himself. The labours of our Free enquirers will tend to bring the evidences on this subject within our reach, they will increase our knowledge and whatever may be the result, truth will be the gainer. —Editor.

EARLY CHRISTIANS.

There is no little deception in the world, and to the shame of professed Christians be it said, there is no little deception in the church.—What fine stories our doctors of divinity can relate! How meek and unoffending were the primitive christians! How ardent was their love! how forbearing was their conduct! It is a pleasing dream to contemplate the Great God clothing himself with flesh, dwelling amongst men, to teach them a system of religion, pure as the light of his celestial throne,—a system of charity and perfection. It is pleasing to mark this religion, gentle as the dew upon Hermon, and beautiful as the roseate blush of Aurora, stealing softly upon the hearts of men, reforming their lives, and, patient under the severest sufferings, diffusing the blessings of benevolence and mercy to all—a pleasing dream—but dream it is. Pure as christianity may be, benevolent as may be its conceptions, this view of its origin is false as the fairy tales of the nursery.

Christianity was mild in its origin! I speak of what has always borne the christian name—it was benevolent! it used no violence! none forsooth. When weak it was the lamb, when strong it was the wolf—aye, the tyger; its mildness was the mountain cataract, its gentle spirit was the swollen torrent, sweeping the fields of the husbandman, bearing the stalls and food for his herds and flocks, overwhelming his house, spreading ruin and devastation round! Christianity, it is said, was persecuted. We hear of the barbarous edicts of Pagan Emperours. Doctors of Divinity, bring a Pagan edict that can match the persecuting spirit of the following, by Constans and Constantius, sons of the great Constantine:

"It is our pleasure that, in all places and all cities, the temple be immediately shut, and carefully guarded, that none have the power of offending. It is likewise our pleasure that all our subjects should abstain from sacrifices. If any one should be guilty of such an act, let him feel the *sword of vengeance*, and *after his execution*, let his property be confiscated to the publick use. We denounce the same penalties against the governours of the provinces, if they neglect to punish the criminals." Such is the language of a *Christian* Emperour in the fourth century. It is no matter whether the law was ever put in force or not, it shows the spirit by which the primitive christians were inspired. Yet we boast of the transcendant purity of the early fathers, and consent to be governed by their *dictum*. Shame on human nature. O, Priests, where is your modesty!

Nothing is here said of what Jesus taught, for were one to teach the doctrine he did, he would be called a Deist; and if Jesus himself should appear among his followers, he would be called an Infidel. Scarcely one of his professed disciples would acknowledge him as *Christian*. His followers have been monsters in vice, and the religion called his, begun in fanaticism, and has proved itself a bitter curse. Instead of boasting of what our ancestors were,

let us humble ourselves under a sense of their foolishness and wickedness, and endeavour to repair the injury they have done, by pursuing knowledge and practising moral goodness.

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

It seems we have involved ourselves in no small difficulty with the editor of the above named paper. We accused the editor of a want of gravity in condescending to exhibit his wit in *puns*. We said but a word, and that word would never have been said, had not the general character of the editor been remarkable for its gravity. He retorts upon us, that we are destitute of that *precious garb*, and attempts to prove it by our own confession.

Now we make no pretensions to gravity.—We have uniformly acknowledged we had none. His retort is therefore useless. We very often laugh. True, we can cry, and we do sometimes look *grave* when we mark the hypocrisy which is so common among editors. But had the practice at which we only laughed, and which has so seriously affected our brother, whom in spite of our levity we sincerely esteem, come from one of our own disposition, it would have passed unnoticed, for it might have been in keeping. But from him who understands applying the terms "Atheist," "Deist," "Infidel," and other opprobrious epithets to a brother editor, whose greatest fault is he has the temerity to be honest, the practice deserved a passing remark. The editor to whom we have alluded is a man of talents, of learning and of piety, and like most pious people, he knows how to stab the characters of those who chance to believe too much or too little to meet his standard of orthodoxy. He scolded at us and we laughed at his puns.

MISSION OF CHRIST.

We have received two letteas requiring us to point out the object of the mission of Christ. We publish under the head of Essayist an article on this subject, written at the suggestion of another correspondent. All we have to say on the subject may be found in that article, or in those which may follow. We invite some of our gifted divines or laymen to furnish us a few short and pointed essays on this subject.

The views to be taken are to solve the following questions. What necessity was there for the mission of Christ? What was his object in coming? Will that object be accomplished? and is the object ascribed to him in scripture reconcilable with reason? We ask both orthodox and heterodox to give us their views.

REMOVAL.

We are requested to state that Br. Whitnall has removed to Ogden, Monroe Co. N. Y, and has engaged to preach to the societies in Riga and Albion. His prospects are represented as promising, and his labours as being successful. May the Great Head the Church be with him, and reward him for his arduous exertions in the cause of our Redeemer.—Ed.

It is not enough for a man to be honest and virtuous. He must be a hypocrite; and what is most difficult, his hypocrisy must deceive himself.

SELECTIONS.

[*From the Columbian Register, printed at New-Haven, Connecticut.*]

CHARITY MISAPPLIED.

It appears from the Annual Report of the American Bible society, that their receipts for the year past amounted to the enormous sum of 143,184 dollars and 33 cents—and that they have given away 8148 Bibles and Testaments: allowing all the money collected, to be expended in the Bibles and Testaments given away, they will cost the moderate sum of 17 dollars and 57 cents each!

Query.—How much money will it require to furnish every destitute family in the United States with a Bible or Testament, at the above price.

From the Same.

Mr. Editor :—A writer in your last paper, who calls himself "A friend to the circulation of the Scriptures," appears to be somewhat disturbed at a short statement made a few weeks since, showing the cost of each Bible given away by the mammoth Bible Society, and attempts to explain away the statement alluded to, by saying "that the greater part of the money received by the Bible Society is for bibles sold." The annual report of that society speaks for itself, and however much this "friend to the circulation of the Scriptures" may be disposed to keep the truth out of sight, and give his statement a false coloring, figures will not lie; and from the Bible Society's Report we learn that they received *for Bibles and Testaments sold* during the last year, 73,688 dollars and 88 cents. Donations 67,917 dollars and 90 cents; and that the number of 200,120 Bibles were issued by the Society. Of this number the astonishing number of 8148 were given away!! Supposing the whole amount of the donations to be expended in Bibles and Testaments, the actual cost of each book the Society gave away was *eight dollars and thirty-three cents!* Notwithstanding some fanatics may fear the "impression" these facts may make upon the public, truth is mighty and will prevail. This pretended "friend to the circulation of the Scriptures" who probably knows the whole secret, tells us that "of all the receipts of this (the bible) society for the past year, about one seventh part only has been at its disposal to enable it to make donations to

to destitute parts of our country, and to foreign lands." Precious confession ! ! and has it come to this, that of all the hard earned money wrung from the hands of the laboring part of the community, from the men servants and maid servants of our land, to furnish the benighted heathen in foreign lands, and the ignorant and destitute of our own country, with the words of eternal life, that *but one dollar in seven* is applied to its intended object ? Is it so that six dollars of every seven given for charitable purposes is required to pay the salaries of agents and sub-agents, and their expenses for travelling in *style* in steamboats and post coaches, and their board at the first and most costly taverns in the country ? Are the ignorant and uninformed to be urged and solicited to give their money for benevolent purposes, and then look on and see six parts in seven of it taken to enable certain drones, under the title of agents, to get their living without labour, out of those who do labour ? Those who like to, may make Bible and other Societies their agents to expend what money they have to spare for charitable purposes, but I think I can do more good with my money than to have it expended in Bibles and Testaments at eight dollars and thirty-three cents a piece. I know that many *honest booksellers* have Bibles and Testaments in great abundance to sell for less than seventy-five cents each.

VIRGINIA AWAKE.

[The following interesting communication from an important section of our country, has just been received, and we cheerfully comply with the request to present it to our readers.]

Staunton, Augusta Co. Va.
August 11, 1829.

Mr. Editor—Much has been done here on the subject of Sabbath Mails. This portion of the country is overrun with Calvinism. It is needless to inform you, that the petition for stopping the mails on Sunday, was signed by a very large number of our citizens. But the clamour which was raised against Col Johnson's Report, and the secrets which Dr. Ely disclosed, have awakened the public mind, and they now begin to see their errour, as the subjoined proceedings of a meeting of respectable citizens will show.

At a meeting held in the Court House of this county, on Monday August the 10th, Thomas Evans, esq. was called to the chair, and Cyrus Currie appointed Secretary. Mr Joseph Harris opened the meeting with a short address, of which the following is the substance.

" Nothing" said Mr. Harris, " has excited greater interest in this part of our country, than the petitions addressed to the last congress, against the transportation of the U. S. Mail on Sunday. This feeling of concern has manifested itself most plainly among a certain sect, (Calvinists) which seems determined to erect if possible, a church establishment in our land, which is the only country enjoying religious liberty on earth. True they disavow any such design, but are not their plans easily penetrated ? And do they not form " the entering wedge of a scheme to make this government a religious despotism, instead of a social and political institution ?' Religion if it has any effect, operates on the consciences of men ; and an attempt to enforce the observance of any of its rites or institutions, is an unjustifiable assumption of power over the conscience. It rests solely on the belief of invisible realities, and of course can derive no weight or solemnity from human sanctions. We approve of a day of rest, but when the laws of the country require it, and the importance of the duty forbids its being neglected, we consider it not only wrong, but dangerous to our liberties that any one should interfere."

After some further remarks, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That we are decidedly opposed to any petitions which have been or may hereafter be offered to Congress against carrying the mail on Sunday.

Resolved, That the evils resulting from such an arrangement would be great, and that business every where would be materially injured, by the stoppage of intelligence one day in seven.

Resolved, That we will not hereafter patronize any individual who is connected with any society or association for the purpose of enforcing the better observance of the Sabbath, by pains and penalties.

Resolved, That we believe it to be the wish of a number of the petitioners to erect an established church in this country.

Resolved, That we consider such schemes as dangerous both to the civil and religious liberties of our citizens, and we think it the duty of every patriot to oppose them.

Resolved, That a committee of seven be appointed to correspond on this subject, with any other committees that may be appointed in other places.

Resolved, That Thomas Harris, Roemus Gordon, Charles Grandison, Andrew Roman, Jas. Venable, Charles Lucas, and Joseph Harris, Esqs. constitute the said committee.

THOMAS EVANS, Chairman.
CYRUS CURRIE, Secretary.

By inserting the above in your valuable paper, you will greatly oblige,

A Friend of Reform.

[*Communicated from Indianapolis, Indiana.*]

Sectarianism is increasing rapidly in this town and neighbourhood, and the religion of Jesus Christ is on the wane. To join to some sect or other, has become the fashion of the day ; and as soon as the cloak is put on, there is in a short time, a sure sign of degeneracy to be seen in the conduct of the new converts,

that shows that they have exchanged the school of moral rectitude, for the school of intrigue and deceit. What better can be expected? Their ministers neglect to impress on their minds the weightier matters, and are strenuous and particular only respecting the *mint*, *annise*, and *cummin*, in religion. There has been scarcely a sermon preached among the prevailing sects, for some months past, without urging the importance of keeping holy the first day of the week, the necessity of taking often the temporal bread and wine, and the duty of water baptism—while each side strenuously contends that their particular mode of baptism is the only right one.

There is also, of late, a tenfold exertion made among the Presbyterians in particular, respecting Sabbath Schools. They have established them in different sections of this county, to the number of twenty schools, and caused the teachers and scholars to make a fourth of July celebration of themselves, as may be seen from the Indianapolis papers of July the 9th, and the advertisement of June 25th, in the same papers. They evidently want their works to be seen of men, like the Pharisees of old.—The Presbyterians persuaded some of the leaders of the Baptists and Methodists to join them in their Union Sabbath School Celebration, notwithstanding what they have seen respecting the designs of the American Sunday School Union. James Morrison, Secretary of State, (a Presbyterian) delivered the Fourth of July Union Sabbath School Celebration Address. The Governor of the state, (a late convert of the Methodist) was also mounted on the stand prepared for the occasion, among the Preachers and Elders of the different sects. The concourse was numerous, the children alone in the ranks amounted to between six and seven hundred. What an army for the next generation, in this new county! Already some of this army, doubtless, are nearly prepared to belong to "Dr." Ely's *christian party in politicks*. If every county throughout the Union should produce as many, he will soon have his number made up. The Presbyterians have discharged the Rev. George Bush, late Pastor in this town for disagreement with them in church discipline, and got another of late more suited to their minds, by the name of John R. Moreland, who stated in his sermon of the 12th of this month, that those persons who withheld their gold and silver from supporting SabbathSchools and the Missionary cause, had better handle red hot bars of iron. He told them it would be better for them in the end. The above are his exact words. Alas! what will be our next doom. *A Friend to True Christianity.*

ANOTHER MEETING OF FREEMEN.

A large and respectable meeting of freemen was held in the Northern Liberties, Philadelphia county, July 21, "for the purpose of considering the most effectual means of preserving our civil rights and privileges inviolate and untrammelled by the influence of ecclesiastical interference and domination." Our readers have already seen in the Reformer the proceedings of several meetings held in this state of a similar kind, and as the proceedings at the above meeting were not materially different from those before given and have been published in several of the papers of this city, we shall only make such extracts from the Preamble and Resolutions adopted by the meeting as are more particularly deserving of notice, which here follow:

"It is not exaggeration to say, for it is notorious, that clerical influence, if it has not, is seeking and striving for pre-eminence; if it has not trammelled civil power, the time is not far distant when that which is now the safeguard of thousands will be defiled by them.

"They have left no means untried to advance their popularity and importance, or add to their already accumulated wealth. They have taken from the widow her *mite*, from the half grown child its donation, and from the more advanced in age, a portion of its pittance to support and extend their views, in connection with Bible, Home, and Foreign Missionary, and Tract Societies, with other institutions equally valueless and unimportant to those who contribute to their support.

"We have read with horrour, the history of past times, and some of them not very remote. Times in which ecclesiastical despotism prevailed, when men were denied the right of private judgement, and not allowed to follow the dictates of their own consciences; when those who differed in sentiment from those in power were denounced, accused of blasphemy and heresy, and made to suffer for asserting their right to think for themselves.

"We shudder at the thought of a recurrence of these things, believing that as respects religion every man is at liberty to think for himself, and that any attempt to coerce man to think and act contrary to the dictates of his own conscience, is an infringement of his natural rights, and a palpable violation of the laws of our country!!—With these views we submit for consideration, the following Resolutions.

"*Resolved*, That we view with reprehension, the numerous attempts that have been made by ecclesiastics and their coadjutors to promote clerical power and domination, and secure to themselves the right and power of dictation in matters of religion.

"*Resolved*, That we consider Bible, Missionary, and Tract Societies, together with the Sunday School Union, Theological Seminaries, &c. established by money drawn from the good natured and simple, as schemes devised by clerical extortioners, to afford them good and easy livings, and establish priestly influence and authority.

"*Resolved*, That we conceive the vast sums of money annually collected by these beggars of sumptuous living, through these schemes of pretended charity and benevolence, were much better applied to the education of our youth, and relieving the distresses of our fellow creatures.

"*Resolved*, That we will not aid nor abet any of the above institutions, believing them to be gross impositions, and calculated to increase the power and influence of the clergy, establish religious intolerance, and subvert our civil liberties.

"*Resolved*, That in order to preserve our civil rights and privileges inviolate and untrammelled by ecclesiastical influence, we will not aid in electing to any civil office, any man that is in favour, or a supporter of the clerical schemes of the day—but will vote for men whose moral character and civil qualifications recommend them to us.

"*Resolved*, That we approve of the design and proceedings of the meetings held in Lancaster and Bucks counties, and Bristol township, and recommend to our fellow citizens to call similar meetings."

MRS. ROYALL AND THE COURT AT WASHINGTON.

The annals of judicial proceedings in this country, perhaps cannot furnish an instance of such another farce as has lately been acted at Washington. Respecting the case of Dr. Watkins, we have nothing to observe, (except the remarkable circumstance of being between seventy and eighty days in making out whether a man was guilty or not, and incurring an expense to the government of 10 or 15,000 dollars,) but the indictment, trial, and condemnation of Mrs. Royall, upon the grounds alleged, are certainly among the most extraordinary and unwarrantable proceedings in the records of our own, or perhaps any other country. This case claims the attention and consideration of every friend to the freedom of speech and of the press in our land, as ominous of future events of the most alarming character to American citizens. The whole transaction is indeed a stain on our country; and the number of editors who have fallen into the current against an unprotected female, and chimed to the same tune with her enemies, fixes that stain still more deep, and will render it more durable.

Mrs. Royall, as is well known, in her writings and speech, has been very severe against the missionary schemes and missionary beggars, as well as tart and pointed in her remarks against the plans and proceedings of certain of the priesthood in our country; and to obtain revenge, (as we learned by disinterested individuals from Washington) one Mr. Duffield, a Presbyterian priest, and a certain man whom Mrs. Royall had called "holy Willy," set their heads to work to plot her downfall. Unfortunately for Mrs. Royall, a court and jury were found willing to listen to the soft words and plausible tales of her enemies, and ready to lend their aid to gratify the vindictive feelings of an offended priesthood and their partisans. To this cause must be ascribed the sentence against Mrs. Royall, viz.—To pay a fine of ten dollars and costs, give security in the sum of 250 dollars for her good behaviour for one year, and stand committed to prison until the sentence be complied with. Mrs. Royall, we learn, has since paid the fine, and her securities, it will be seen, are among the first people at Washington, to wit—Major Lewis, the second Auditor of the Treasury; Dr. Jones, the city Post Master; Mr. Henston; and Major Eaton, Secretary of War.

The following is a sketch of Mrs. Royall's address.

[*From the New-York Telescope.*]

SKETCH OF MRS. ROYALL'S ADDRESS TO THE JURY.

"May it please the court, and you gentlemen of the jury—I am glad it has come to this, although the proceedings against me are a blot on the country which ages will not wipe out. The motive is too evident to delude the understanding of the court. There is a deep laid plan at the bottom, which ought to fill every citizen with solemn fear. It is not a question between A and B you are called on to decide; it is a question between Liberty and Slavery. This is clear from the quarter from whence it comes, and from the individuals who compose the witnesses. It is the mere echo of the Sunday mail men, whose scheme is clothed in this wide disguise. These are the same men who have persecuted me with unceasing rancour since I began to expose their impositions on the people. In one instance they made an attempt upon my life—I mean the same sect—and with pens steeped in gall, have hunted me from one end of the Union to the other. I am a stranger in your land, gentlemen of the jury, and one of those heathens whom these religious men pretend to counsel, yet they never attempted to counsel me, or give me a mouthful of bread; and though they have heaped every species of slander and falsehood upon me, down to this day, and have ransacked every corner of the city to hunt up my bitterest enemies, they have not been able to produce a single immoral act of my life. It is therefore clear as the sun at noonday, that I am persecuted for my religious opinions.

"Not one who hears me this day but must be convinced that the prosecution against me, is one of fearful tendency, and should they succeed, no man will be safe. When they were defeated last winter, they wrote to their friends in Congress not to be discouraged.—'We will gain a little now,' said they, 'and a little again.' This is one of the littles. Let them once get the wedge in, and the Judge on

the bench, and the President in his seat, may tremble for their liberty. I hope, therefore, gentlemen, that you will meet these encroachments upon our civil and religious liberty like freemen. Give this dangerous sect a precedent, and our liberty is gone. Permit me, therefore, to impress upon your minds, that the moment has arrived when you are called on to say whether you will surrender your liberties to an aspiring priesthood, or nobly resolve to be free. The eyes of the world are upon you.—Now is the time, in this temple of justice, to decide by your verdict the fate of posterity."

Alas for the fate of posterity—her appeal was unavailing.

[The following paragraph from the Baltimore Republican, gives a pretty striking picture of the court and jury that indicted and sentenced Mrs. Royall. The Editor, Mr. Sanderson, was summoned to Washington by this same court and grand jury, to answer for something he had published respecting their proceedings so that this long court, like the Presbyterian Long Parliament in England, seemed disposed to hold in check or exercise a supervision over the whole nation, and substitute itself in place of a gag law upon all the presses of the country, by impressing upon editors the majesty and extent of its authority. With the editor of the Republican, we congratulate the nation at the conclusion of the legal *mummery* that has been so long carried on at Washington, and hope such an other may never be witnessed in our country. But to proceed to the paragraph alluded to.]

"The editor of this paper has appeared and went through an examination before the grand jury at Washington, in obedience to their much talked of summons. The object of the summons proved to be *impertinent curiosity*.—The grand jury wanted to pry into our private correspondence! and we did not indulge them of course; and of course we were discharged; because the *ignoramusses* found out they had no law to compel us to reply to their stupid and impudent queries. We congratulate the nation at large, at the conclusion of the legal *mummery* which has been carried on in various shapes, for the last sixty days at Washington. The court are composed of such materials as Skakspeare only could describe; the counsel are worried to their last gasp. The farce is ended—*Exeunt omnes!*"

[*From the Western Times of June 27, printed at Centreville Indiana.*]

Mrs. Royal has again appeared before the publick, in her character of authoress. We know of no American lady of the present day whose writings attract so great attention, or evince so close an observance of men and manners. The mother and brother of Mrs. Royall live near us, with whom we have been acquainted several years—with the brother very intimately so. They are both persons of intelligence, and the old lady, apparently 90 years of age, retains a distinct recollection of the principal characters of the revolution—particularly those of Virginia, her native state.

Presbyterian Statistics for the year 1829.

Among the funds reported by the Presbyterians, as having been collected during the last year, are the following: For Foreign and Domestic Missions, 39,180 dollars and 53 cents; for the support of Theological Seminaries, 10,054 dollars and 52 cents; and for training up young men for the ministry, 20,390 dollars and 54 cents; in all, 73,068 dollars and 26 cents. If to this were added the amount collected to pay for preaching, building meeting-houses, &c. we should have a sum that would astonish many of our citizens, and might sanctify the whole nation, if money could have any tendency to produce such an effect.

The number of Missionaries employed by the *American Sunday School Union* the last year, for promoting its interests, was fourteen, besides its numerous agents. The number of teachers belonging to the society at the time of its late annual report, was 52,663, and the number of its scholars was 349,202, being an increase of 19,907 teachers and 80,546 scholars since the report of the preceding year.—Thus by system and perseverance this clerical engine moves forward in spite of all the opposition made to impede its progress.

AGENTS.

Stephen Parsons, Denmark Lewis co. N. Y.—Nathan Chichester, Sherwood's Corners.

Mr Hobbs, Louisville K. Y., in place of E. Lord, who has subjected us and our subscribers to much inconvenience by collecting money for the Advocate and not making returns thereof. Whenever we are so unfortunate through misinformation as to appoint improper, or disresponsible agents, our subscribers are requested to give us notice, and remit the money directly to the publisher.

THE FOLLOWING BOOKS ARE FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Kneeland's Greek and Eng. Testament,
Do. Lectures,
Balfour's 1st and 2d Inquiry,
Ballou on Atonement,
Do. notes on Parables,
Light of Truth,
Canfield's Review,
Ancient History of Universalism, by H. Ballou 2d,
History of Universalism, by T. Brown.

Together with a variety of pamphlets published by distinguished Universalists. The above books are chiefly so well known that any recommendation from us would be superfluous. Ancient History of Universalism is a new work, and one which all classes of readers should be anxious to possess.

Poetick Department.

From the Worcester Yeoman.

THE CHEROKEE'S REPLY.

To the proposition that they should move beyond the Missisippi.

No never! we wear not the shackles of slaves,
And our fathers' stern spirits would start in their graves, [tread,
If they heard in their lov'd haunts the stranger's proud
Trample lightly the wild grass that waves o'er their bed.

We own not your laws or your treaties—this soil
Shall be ours, till your armies have made it their spoil,
For 'twas ours by the gift, by the charter of God,
Long long ere its wilds by the white man were trod.

There was strength in the bow of the red hunter then,
And the foe fled before the stern Cherokee men.
Then far as the eye now o'er forest can roam,
Was the land of the free, and our own sacred home.

But woe to the day when a welcoming hand,
Spread the bounteous feast for the white man's weak hand,
They came to our shores, a lone shelterless few,
They drank of our cup and they e'er found us true,
But the serpent we cherished and warmed at our breast,
Has coiled round our vitals—let time tell the rest.

——No, never! if perish we must from the earth,
Let us die where we've lived in the land of our birth
'Tis in vain we are told of a lovelier scene,
Far away, where the deer rove in forests more green,
Where the step of the stranger will never intrude,
And Nature still smiles in her own solitude.

Yon oak, round whose head the lightnings have play'd
Till its withering form is scarce traced in its shade—
Say! would you its beauty and vigor restore,
If you plant it anew on some far distant shore?
Oh no, while its roots cling to where it once grew,
It may linger a life which no art can renew.

It is thus with our race; we can never again
Repeople the forest nor hope to regain
The power of the past. The dark warriour's form
Is blasted and bowed by the merciless storm.
Then leave us to die, midst our own native shade,
Where they grow in their pride—there alone let us fade.

STANZAS.

There's many a brow that wears a smile,
Above a heart of care;
And many a laughing eye conceals,
The writhing of despair.
We would not that the world should see,
The bosom's dark recess;
We would not that the world should know,
Its utter loneliness.

The crowded hall—the joyous scenes—
Cannot dispel our grief,
In pleasure's gaudy, glittering train,
In vain we seek relief.
There lurks a sorrow in the heart—
A deep corroding care—
We turn us from the mirthful throng,
To view the anguish there.

And vain are beauty's smiles to light,
The ruins of the soul,
And worse than vain the maddening draught;
The wine cup and the bowl.
Its pleasures, like the fitful blaze,
Within the silent tomb;
Whose flickering light but shows more clear,
Its sad funereal gloom.

In vain we seek in solitude
The calmness of repose;
In vain we court the stilly grove,
Neglectful of our woes.
Grief still will hover o'er the soul,
And we must yet endure.
Misfortune that no charms may heal,
No human heart may cure.

TAKE BACK THE BOWL.

Take back the bowl! take back the bowl!
Reserve it for polluted lips—
I will not bow a tameless soul
Beneath its dark and foul eclipse
I knew that life must henceforth be
A weary and unblessed thing;
That hope can lend no ray to me,
No flowers along my pathway spring.

Well, be it so—my life hath been
Beyond the low and vulgar aim—
The deeds of base and heartless men
Have never dimmed my honest name;
And I am proud—aye, even now,
Amid the shades of deepest ill;
The fearless tread—the open brow—
The bribeless hand are left me still.

Take back the bowl!—I will not steel
The hallowed memories of the past—
They add no pangs to those I feel,
Nor shadows on the future cast.
Aye, take it back! let others bring
Oblivion o'er the haunted soul—
My memory is a blessed thing—
Away! away!—take back the bowl.

An upright heart—a guiltless brow—
A soul unbowed, are left alone;
I will not break in madness now,
The only staff I lean upon;
The keenest pangs that grief can send
Shall never prompt to deeds accursed—
Take back the bowl!—I will not bend
A towering spirit to the dust.

I SPEAK NOT—I TRACE NOT.

Recovered fragment of Lord Byron.

I speak not, I trace not, I breathe not my name,
There is grief in the sound, there were guilt in the fame,
But the tear which now burns on my cheek may impart
The deep thought that dwells in that silence of heart.

Too brief for our passions, too long for our peace,
Where those hours can their joy or their bitterness cease:

We repent we abjure, we well break from our chain
We must part, we must fly, to unite it again.

Oh! thine be the gladness and mine be the guilt,
Forgive me adored one, forsake if thou wilt,
But the heart which I bear shall expire undebased,
And man shall not break it, whatever thou mayest.

And stern to the haughty but humble to thee,
My soul in its bitterest blackness shall be;
And our days seem as swift and our moments more sweet,
With thee by my side, than the world at our feet.

One sigh of thy sorrow one look of thy love
Shall turn me or fix, shall reward or reprove;
And the heartless may wonder at all we resign,
Thy lip shall reply not to them, but to mine.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator is published every other Saturday, by* U.F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, OCTOBER, 3, 1829. [NO. 20.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.

A SERMON.

MANKIND AUTHOURS OF THEIR OWN MISERY.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

Delivered before the Black River Association of Universalists at Rutland, Jefferson Co. N. Y. June, 1829.

[NOTE.—The following sermon, perhaps exhibits the outlines of that peculiar system, for which the authour has received the censure of his brethren, more clearly than any other he has published. It has been delivered in several places and has been equally praised and censured. Though hastily written and very imperfect as a composition, we yield to the pressing request of both friends and enemies to insert it in the Advocate. Whatever may be its character for *piety*, we are conscious its *morality* cannot be censured, and if it should be supposed deficient in directions to ensure Heaven hereafter, no man of common sense can doubt the efficacy of its principles, if obeyed, in making mankind happy on earth. O. A. B.

"The foolishness of man perverteth his way and his heart fretteth against the Lord."—Prov. xix. 3.

There is nothing more common than for men when in affliction, to murmur against Providence and to charge their sufferings to the Almighty. Suffering, pain, anxiety or distress of some kind or other, has been the common lot; and that the miseries the human race are compelled to endure, are many and heavy to be borne, no man of feeling can dispute. So general is the conviction, that this is a world of sorrow, that not a few have supposed it a vast Purgatory, in which we are punished for sins committed by our souls in some other mode of existence. However this may be a careful history of the past, and close observation of the present, will establish the position of our text, that "the foolishness of man perverteth his way and his heart fretteth against the Lord."

There are few studies more profitable than those which have for their object, acquaintance with the cause of our sufferings and the means by which they are to be removed. Placed as we are here, surrounded by so much that is painful, exposed on every hand to a thousand dangers, ignorant of our best interests, and of the means by which it can be promoted, we are not to be surprised at the universal enquiry, "whence came the deep, and often aggravated wretchedness to which life is subject?" No indeed are we to consider it strange, that when we find all our fond built hopes destroyed, all our bright, and brightening prospects suddenly blasted by some unforeseen event—when we have toiled, exposed to the burning rays of a noon day sun, and amid the chill damps of evening, all is rendered vain by some contingency which we could neither foresee nor present—it is not strange that in these moments, when the heart is pained and the soul full of bitterness, men should murmur at their lot and think Providence less kind than he might be.

Though this murmuring is often charged upon us as a crime, I am far from blaming man for sometimes feeling his lot is hard and that he has little for which he should be thankful. It is easy for those who have never suffered, whose hopes have never proved deceitful, and whose hearts have never been involved in the ten thousand "ills which flesh is heir to"—it is easy for such as these to rail against him who is not wholly resigned, who cannot see the hand of kindness in what he endures. But a superficial view of life, and a superficial view is nearly all that most men can take, will in some measure justify complaints and render him not criminal who cannot feel wholly resigned to what he suffers.

I would always recommend resignation to those evils which are proved to be unavoidable, but resignation, to the extent most religionists carry it, cannot be too earnestly deprecated.—Had I the toothache, and were I unable to remove it by any skill of the dentist, I might, perhaps try to be resigned. But were I suffering the rage of penury, instead of being resigned, instead of thanking God for my wretchedness, I should endeavour to remove it by my industry in some useful calling.

There is nothing more injurious to society or detrimental to the welfare of individuals, than the doctrine which teaches every thing is from God, that it is our duty to submit to be resigned. Without calling in question in this place the truth of the position every thing comes from God, we may remark the injunction is in the first place generally impractible. Lacerated by want, despoiled by the injustice of a fellow being, racked with pain and disease, it is scarcely in the power of him who deserves the name of man, to be resigned. We may *say* we are, our tongues may pronounce the watch-word of the party and swear fealty to the doctrine, but

the heart does, and will rebel. Who, when stretched upon a bed of sickness, when drawing near to the grave, when filled with the awful forebodings of what may be—life eternal or sleep without end—does not wish his pain removed and his existence prolonged?

"For who to dumb forgetfulness a prey,
This pleasing, anxious being ere resigned,
Left the warm precincts of the cheerful day,
Nor cast one longing, ling'ring look behind?"

Men can endure, they often endure much with firmness, without uttering the least complaint, but none love pain, none can feel contented to dwell in the midst of wretchedness.

The injunction is not only impracticable but every attempt to obey it is attended with consequences deeply pernicious. Go tell man, miserable man, that it is his duty to be resigned whatever be his lot—tell him that to complain, is to rebel against Heaven, and you paralyze all the energies of his mind, instead of arousing his soul, arming him against the ills he endures stimulating him to remove them by some powerful effort, you lull him to apathy, and perpetuate what you ought to destroy.—Man should be an active being. He is not placed here to endure evil without murmur or exertion. His forture is placed in his own hands; and if he will exert himself he may make life comfortable, if not perfectly happy he may approximate a better condition.

Whoever will look at the common notions on this subject may without any deep philosophical research, readily divine their origin. They are but the tools of the priest and of the despot, invented to aid them in their attempts to domineer over men, to rob them of their possessions, by teaching them subjection. All power was said to be of God; to resist them was to rebel against God. Hence the tyrant sat secure on his throne of oppression and blood. If the people suffered they were told it was the will of God they should suffer, and as they expected his blessing they must submit and if they would be certain of his favour they must be perfectly resigned.

I dislike such notions. They lead to imbecility of mind and to feebleness of exertion. I would rather magnify the evils we suffer—would paint them in the most vivid colours, that I might wake every energy of the mind, create a universal enquiry, and prompt every one to the highest degree of action. I dislike doctrines of submission. I have found my highest felicity in being active, the same I believe is true of all. The constitution of every one is for action, and would I could persuade all that indolence is a curse they cannot too scrupulously deprecate, and that to try to submit to every untoward event is the surest means to perpetuate the misery we ought to remove.

But though I condemn the common doctrine of submission and resignation I am far from justifying complaints against Heaven, far indeed from saying our sufferings come from God, and that we have reason to complain of the dispensations of his providence. It is not to God we are to ascribe our misfortunes. "The foolishness of man perverteth his way and his heart fretteth against the Lord." To make this apparent let us look at life, ask of experience and be instructed by facts. Perhaps we shall perceive the evils of which we complain, may be traced to some imperfection in ourselves, to the imperfectly organized society in which we live, and to the ignorance and pernicious habits which belong to us as individuals.

Look into private life, do you hear one complain of poverty, bemoan his hard lot and exclaim against the partiality of God who has made such inequality among his children? Look at this poor man, whose family is suffering all the rage of the most abject want. How came he poor? Can you not trace the cause to his misspent hours? To his intemperance? To his imprudence? Or to the rapacity of others? What has the Lord to do with this? Does he make one man an idler, another industrious? One economical, another profligate? You need not look so far. The cause is nearer home.

Mark that man. He is honest, upright and industrious. He is prosperous. He is respected. He fills places of trust, of honour and emolument. His children are trained to paths of usefulness and respectability. His houses and lands increase. He lives in the midst of plenty. Look again. Pass by his fields, the enclosures are broken down, the fences are removed, weeds infest the ground—briars and thorns grow unmolested, where once flourished what sustained life. Mark his house, its shattered condition—enter the once abode of felicity, look at that sorrowing female, half famished, brooding over her blasted hopes and the ruin of all that was to her lovely or desirable—look at her half naked and half starved children, calling in vain for a father's care. Has God done this? Has he reduced that family? Made that wife wretched? and those children worse than fatherless? Pass by to the tavern or the grocery, there sits the wretch carousing with the vilest, there the author of their misfortunes. His bloated face, his broken constitution and squalid aspect, reveal the cause. "He put an enemy in his mouth to steal away his brain." His intemperance, his neglect of his affairs have wrought the change and sunk him so low. No need of ascribing it to God. No need of saying Heaven made his wife and children wretched, 'twas caused by the foolishness of man.

Was that a man of wealth? Is his family now in want? Is the wife compelled to pine in secret, to feel the keen anguish which only woman can feel? Are his children doomed to grow up companions for the vilest? To become the inmates of a prison or the victims of a gallows? Look at the gambling table—there you may find the divinity that entails his curse; there

you may see the curse of his ruin. In the haunts of dissipation he frequents, you may find the god who sports with human happiness, who blasted this man's character and fortunes, and dearer than all, the peace and character of his family, and caused the vast amount of sorrow.

I need not enlarge, I might exhibit examples of injustice, of fraud &c. but it is not necessary. The principle is the same wherever found.—Our external condition depends chiefly upon ourselves. Not indeed wholly upon our individual exertions, but always either upon them or upon those of the society with which we are connected. Our own foolishness perverteth our way. We need not therefore arraign heaven with our misfortunes. Does God make the drunkard, the gambler, the debauchee, the knave and the murderer? No, breathe not the thought; it is man's indiscretion, man's own folly.

Extend your views from individuals, from private families to states and empires, and you may recognize the same principle. Do you weep over the ruins of nations which have been? Does your heart sink within you as you ask whither has fled the glory of states and empires so renowned in ancient story? Do you ask where is the industry, activity and wealth of Egypt, the commerce of Tyre, the refinement of Greece, the haughty greatness of Rome, once mistress of the world? Do you hear the night-bird flap his shaggy wings over the fallen colonnades and moss grown temples of Tadmour, the dismal owl call to his fellow, and do you see the beast of prey prowl where stood Babylon, Balbeck and other cities which so proudly shone in oriental climes? Do you wander among the ruins of art and look in vain for a thriving and happy population? Do you sit in solitude where once arose the joyous din of gladdened courts? What see you in all this? The hand of God? or do you not rather recognize it as the work of man?

If you will be at the pains to look closely at the rise and fall of nations, you will find that their prosperity and their decline may alike be attributed to human agency. When a nation obeys the simple laws of nature, maintains strict justice in its internal and external affairs, when it allows free scope to individual enterprise, and encourages industry and integrity in its citizens, it prospers. But when vice is allowed to creep into its councils, when the courts become corrupt, the administration of justice entrusted to unskilful, or to dishonest hands, when a thirst for dominion takes possession of its government, when inequality is produced among the citizens, when oppression on one hand and slavery on the other, or one part enslaved by luxury and effeminacy, and the other by poverty and want, the nation falls. The virtues which raised it are no more; the bands which cemented it are broken, it falls, crumbles to pieces and is lost in barbarism and wretchedness. Not by a malediction from God, nor by any unfriendlyness of Providence, or sternness of fate, but by the natural operation of those principles by which all things are governed.

Will you tell me the bible reads a different story, that the word of God declares it is Jehovah who setteth up kings and pulleth them down, that it is he who causes the nation to rise or to fall? Thus I know the bible teaches but it is in a refined or metaphysical sense entirely different from the one in which I am now treating the subject. The bible declares God is good, and who does not know goodness cannot be the authour of evil when it has the power to prevent?

If you will look into the mind, at that internal anguish we feel, at the fire which consumes the brain and dries up all the sources of joy, you may test the same principle and find all is by "the foolishness of man."

Must we attribute our mental agonies to God? or not rather to ourselves? Let us look closely, perhaps we have fostered some bad principle, nourished with more than maternal fondness, some favourite notion, which has corrupted the heart, we may have performed some act which now returns with remorse, poisons the soul and darts the keenest pangs through all the inner man. Perhaps if we retrospect our lives with impartiality, we shall be convinced, the cause of our uneasiness is not seated in the distant heavens, nor lodged in the bosom of the divinity, but in our own bosoms, in our "foolishness which perverteth our way." Let us then cease to fret against the Lord, and let us too, cease preaching submission and resignation, let us, instead of weeping over our miseries, "by taking arms end them."

We are not to suppose God will, for our sakes, reverse the laws which he established, on the morn of creation, for the government of the world. The laws are lasting as the existence of Jehovah, and as unchangeable in their operation as his own immutability. It is for us to find out those which lead to our felicity and to obey them. Instead of sitting down with the dupes of priests, and supinely waiting for some divinity to interfere in our behalf, instead of wasting our time and strength in praying some invisible being to suspend the laws of nature, we should learn ourselves, learn our own strength, and rely on our own powers. Call this want of reverence, call it blasphemy, call it defiance of Heaven, call it what you please, it is a truth attested by all past experience, and proclaimed by heaven and earth, *that man will never be universally happy, in this world, until he is convinced he must rely on himself, and depend on his own exertions for his prosperity.*

I know what your teachers tell you; I know *they* labour to destroy all self confidence; I know they would make you despise yourselves,

believe you are nothing, can do nothing; I know too, they do this under pretence of honoring God, but little thanks will God give them for such honour, and little do they care for the honour of God if they can be well fed and clothed themselves. They might be right in reference to another world. They design their instructions for a world unknown to me. I shall not say they are wrong. If they design their instructions for that world, it is well. Let them go and preach to its inhabitants, we do not want them here. It will be time enough to attend to the concerns of another world when we learn what those concerns are, and when we become interested in them. At present we belong to the earth, to which I aim to adapt my instructions, and I think it would be well if all would do the same.

But, to honour God! Who shall honour Jehovah? Has he entrusted the keeping of his honour to us, to such weak creatures as we are? If he has, he has had little regard for his honour for it is most certainly in poor hands. But how shall we honour God? Shall the farmer honour him by falling upon his knees and pouring forth a prayer, while the weeds infest his garden and his fields lie waste, overgrown with thistles and thorns? Shall he honour God by neglecting to cultivate the earth, to raise sustenance for himself and family? By living in poverty, in abject want, and ascribing all he suffers to the Providence of God? Priests may say so. Fools may believe so. I cannot. If we neglect the means of happiness, we must charge ourselves with the misery which follows.

I hate the common doctrine on this head.—The priest, with all the gloom of the grave-yard, comes forward mid sighs, tears, and groans, deploring the misery which prevails. He teaches all is owing to sin, but sin he says we cannot remove, though we deserve endless damnation if we do not. We must pray to God, we must not presume to do ought in our own strength. My brethren, the biggest knaves in the world are often praying knaves. I would be grateful to my God for the existence he has given me, for the world in which he has placed me, for the means of happiness which he has put within my reach, and for the hopes he has vouchsafed me, but I cannot importune him to bless me in my laziness, or to make me happy in my foolishness.

Look at this doctrine—you are a farmer.—Beware, plough not your ground, scatter no seeds in the furrowed earth, but go to prayer, pray the Lord to bless you in your "basket and in your store," and to give you your daily bread, how much grain, think ye, you would raise? Let the mechanick forsake his shop, the merchant his goods, every one his employment, all go to the misnamed house of God, how long would they find bread and wine enough to celebrate the Lord's supper? Let us be devotional, but let us show our devotion by our industry, honesty and faithfulness in our several callings.

Would mankind be happy, let the idler forsake his idleness, the trifler his trifles, he drunkard his cups, the gambler his tables and his dissolute companions, the dissipated the haunts of dissipation, the fool his folly, the knave his injustice, the infidel his faithlessness, the evil his wickedness, the learned his pedantry, and let all engage in the acquisition of useful knowledge, and in some branch of productive industry; evil shall then disappear, misery cease, universal righteousness prevail, and earth reflect the image of the Paradise of God.

My brethren, I have now presented you my thoughts. God is good, no evil comes from him. Man is imperfect, ignorant, foolish and wicked, hence the origin of misery. God is right but man is wrong. Man is then the being to be corrected; he is the authour of his own sufferings, let him reform, and he may be happy.—Let him continue inactive or depending on some invisible power to reform him, and his misery may remain. Awake then, O man! learn to depend on thyself, as thou hast caused thine own misery look to thyself for its removal, and exert thyself without delay, and God will bless thy exertions.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

A GOSPEL CREED.

Sometime since I published "my creed," and so far as I can learn, contrary to all my expectations, every body liked it, only some thought it did not go far enough. That creed, I considered necessary for every one to believe; the one I am now about to present my readers, is a matter of opinion; on which every one may exercise his own judgement, believe or reject, and still, for ought I know, be a good man. I do not consider myself any better, merely because I believe it, nor do I believe any one any the worse because he does not believe; though it is my opinion, that its tendency will be the production of good feeling and an increase of enjoyment. My reasons for writing it are to gratify a class of readers, who are anxious to know what a man believes, and also to remove a complaint made to me by a valuable brother in the ministry, viz. that I do not let what I aim at be known.

I. The Gospel, according to my view of it, recognizes the existence of ONE God and of only one, who is the prime mover of all things, whose will has established the laws of nature, whose moral character is impartial justice, based upon universal goodness and infinite mercy.

II. This God exhibits, in the government of the world, wisdom to admire and goodness to adore; that all which is necessary for us to know of his power and Godhead, is instampted on his works and may be read in his word.

III. A particular display of divine love and mercy is recorded in the writings of the New Testament—a

display made by Jesus of Nazareth, the greatest and best Reformer ever vouchsafed us by Heaven.

IV. The object of Jesus, (or of God in raising him up,) was to reform the world. Not to appease the anger of God, not to make an expiatory sacrifice to render God propitious, but to lead men to repentance or reformation.

V. The means used to effect this reformation are the example, the precepts, the sufferings, the doctrine and the death, of Jesus Christ. These operate in a natural way, same as a good example to follow and a correct faith, tends to purify the heart and lead to the practice of virtue. They operate not irresistibly but persuasively, do not compel us to be good but entice us to virtue.

VI. That no man will be sentenced to endless misery and that no one shall be doomed to endure more misery than naturally grows out of his physical and moral condition is a doctrine of the Gospel. Yet this misery all must endure, and their only hope of relief is in the improvement of their condition, which improvement it is the duty and interest of all to effect.—Deity forgives us past offences, gives us motives to reformation and exhorts us to reform, but Deity does not reform for us, we must effect this ourselves. The means are given us and if we do not use them the fault is ours.

VII. That all will finally become holy seems highly probable. Though some consider this point positively settled, yet as one class of these consider a part will never become holy, and the other are positive that all will, I deem it a matter not positively decided, I should consider the salvation of all men as an inferential doctrine, rather than as one positively taught. I infer it from the goodness of God and the perfection towards which all his works tend, which makes it almost certain that in their progressive operations the period will come when man will cease his folly and learn to pursue virtue as his chief good. It is also inferred from the fact that the goodness of God has made happiness possible to all, giving all the means of procuring it, and it would be absurd to say God will ever take them away, if they always remain we shall some time or other learn to use them.

VIII. Endless misery is no Gospel doctrine, Annihilation is no part of philosophy, and to suppose a total unconsciousness of being to last through eternity is not reconciliable with the resurrection of all as taught by all the new testament writers. Hence my opinion is that all mankind will by some process or other, not known to me, pass from this state of being to another analagous to it. As man is a progressive being here, as his happiness is generally in proportion to his knowledge and active virtue, so I conclude it will be hereafter. And though my heaven has not so much immediate felicity as the Universalist supposes neither has it the misery of the orthodox hell.

I do not like the notion of teaching men they may sin all their lives and be equally happy at death with the most virtuous. I do not say this because I think it would be any loss to the virtuous, nor because I am unwilling the wicked should fare so well, God forbid that I should ever envy any one the small pittance of happiness he may obtain. But the order of the divine government seems to be on different principles, and moreover such a sentiment does not seem to place the rewards of virtue in a light sufficiently clear to arrest the attention of the thoughtless and the careless. The rewards of virtue are permanent and lasting, and to have a good moral effect man ought to be taught the road to happiness lies only through the practice of moral goodness. As I am unable to perceive any thing in death which can work a moral change any farther than a change of some physical properties may change the directions of the passions, I conclude our happiness in another world will be proportioned to our moral goodness, and I know no better criterion by which to determine that moral goodness on entering that world than by measuring the degree of improvement with which we left this.

We call a vicious man miserable. It is so in this world and I conclude it will be, so long as he retains his vicious character, whether in this world or in the next. This makes the restraint of vice clear and powerful. It comes "home to men's bosoms and business," and deters us by every consideration which can influence the mind. Heaven and hell are not considered local dwellings but mere states of the mind, both are felt in a certain degree here, and both for ought I know may be felt hereafter.

These notions make the other world one with which we can have some sympathy. If you will tell me of another world, tell me something tangible to the mind, something which I can feel. The vague report of a song eternal sounding upon golden harps, may be very pleasing to those who love musick. But an idle song may loose its charms and it is a thousand times more pleasing to my mind to contemplate the future world as a scene of active virtue, where all the kind and benevolent feelings of the heart may be exercised, where we may do good to each other and employ our leisure and our new faculties in examining the works of our Creator. But enough for the present. This article contains matter for much future speculation. My readers will pardon me for troubling them with my notions about an invisible world. I do not often trouble them thus, and they must view this weakness, if such they will call it, with an indulgent eye.

I have now presented my speculative creed and I know enough of human nature to know it will be read with interest, and enough of sectarism to know it will be most grievously censured. It will suit neither orthodox nor heterodox, for by pursuing a middle course adopting the excellences of all, none will find their own peculiarities flattering, none of their dear propensities retained, I deprecate no censure. For the gratification of some I have given my opinion, all may make as much of it as they can, believe it or not is the same to me.

SELECTIONS.

We select the following from the Eastern Chronicle a paper published in Maine. The individual of whom it gives an account, we have never heard of before,

but the lesson is instructive. We have drawn our moral from it, let our readers do the same for themselves.—Ed. Gos. Adv.

HENRY M'CAUSLAND.

Almost every one, we suppose has heard of "*old M'Causland*," the veteran prisoner, who, for thirty five long years, has been confined in a solitary cell in the county jail at Augusta. Many, too—very many, prompted by curiosity, have looked through his iron grates, and beholding the stately form, grave countenance and long white beard of him who has not seen the sun nor an object in the world without for more than one generation, have listened to the simple, well committed story of the tragical circumstances which brought him there. They will see him no more. The old man is gone. His body has at length left the dark, damp dungeon in which he had been immured for more than a third of a century, and death has kindly set his spirit free forever. He died on Friday, the 21st ult. aged 70 years.

The circumstances that cut him off forever from the society of man, and that consigned him to prison for life, were peculiar, and go far to show how mistaken views of religious duty may sometimes drive people to the most shocking extremes. M'Causland was an inhabitant of this town at the time of his imprisonment. His devotion to religion, or what was then, and perhaps now is, by some, *considered* religion, operated so powerfully upon some peculiar passion, as to render him on that subject partially insane. On all other subjects, except religion, he was, and to his death remained, perfectly rational. Instances, we believe, are on record, of similar mental alienation confined to subjects operating on other passions of the mind. In this state of religious fanaticism, he imagined that he was called of God to make a burnt offering and a sacrifice. For a time he struggled against this fancied, but as it appeared to him, *real*, divine command. At length, however, he yielded under the persuasion that he should obey God rather than man. In the execution of his supposed duty, he set fire to the Church in this place, which was consumed. This was his "burnt offering." In his conflict with the Spirit as to the necessity of making a "sacrifice," he was reminded of the scripture declaration, that "without the shedding of blood is no remission of sin." It was plain, then, to him, that in order to have his sins remitted he must shed human blood. He knew that for so doing he would have to suffer capital punishment; but this would be to "suffer for Christ's sake," which would be highly meritorious on his part, and give him a stronger claim on the blessings of heaven hereafter.—These considerations led him to seek for a victim.

There was a female—a married woman—residing in the back part of the town, who, as he interpreted the Scriptures, had sinned against the Father, against the Son, and against the Holy Ghost, in that as *he* thought, or as the Spirit had revealed the secret to him, had given birth to three illegitimate children. These three corresponded to the number of persons in the Trinity, against each of whom the offence was therefore severally committed. The Lord directed him to choose her as the victim for sacrifice.

Accordingly he selected his time, and in the still hours of night, launched a boat into the Cobbosse Contee stream and made his way, not without much difficulty and fatigue, for he had rips to encounter in his passage, to the residence of the woman, who was then confined to her bed by sickness. Arrived at the house, he entered without ceremony. A female attendant was sitting near the bed, watching the sick female. Without saying much, he proceeded to the bed-side and noticing a large butcher's knife, recently whetted, pending from the ceiling at the head of the bed, with one hand he seized the head of the woman and with the other took down the knife and drew it with a single fatal stroke across the throat of his victim. "She bled," said he to us a few weeks ago, with a smile that sometimes accompanies an act of conscious duty—"she bled like a calf!" He took no instrument of death with him; and when he discovered the knife near his intended victim, he knew it was provided by Him who sent him, to enable him to fulfil his painful commission. The woman died immediately; and having made both a burnt offering and a sacrifice, he was willing to abide all the consequences which might follow the execution of mere *human* laws. We believe he made no effort to conceal himself after the commission of this murderous act. Immediately he was arrested on the charge of murder. The charge, it proved against him, or acknowledged to be true by him, would subject him to the penalty of death. When brought into Court, the indictment being read and he being interrogated—are you guilty or not guilty? "*Guilty*," he replied. The Judges, apprehending that in the perpetration of the deed, he had not acted under the influence of a sane mind, proposed that he should plead "not guilty," in order that the Jury might bring in a verdict that he was not guilty by reason of insanity, which would avert the sentence of *death*. The Chief Justice, therefore, remarked to him, that he was under no obligation to plead "guilty." If the Government had charged him with a crime, the burden was on the Government to *prove* him guilty; and suggested to him the expediency of recalling his plea, and pleading "*not guilty*." "What!" returned Mr. M'Causland, "would the honourable Judges of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts advise me to *lie*? I *did* kill the woman. I *am* guilty." The Judges, on this reply, were thrown into an unpleasant dilemma. His guilt

being established by his own confession, nothing remained for them but to pronounce the dread sentence of the law—*death*. Not wishing to do this, under the circumstances of the case, they removed him to prison *to await his sentence;* and there he remained *thirty-five years* waiting for his sentence with murmurs against the Court for its unreasonable delay!

Mr. M'Causland might indeed have been sentenced, and then pardoned by the Executive; but a pardon would give him his liberty, and it was not thought safe that he should again be let loose on Society lest the Lord should call him again to commit some other fatal act. The safety of community required his confinement. He accordingly remained in his narrow cell until his decease.

The curiosity excited amongst strangers to see this prisoner, was a source of income to him. Each spectator, before he could behold him, was required by M'Causland to pay him two cents, and then he would proceed to exhibit his tall, stout body, long beard, delicate hands, &c. to give a history of the circumstances that brought him to the prison, to sing, pray for the visiters, &c. &c. The fees which he collected from visitors amounted some years, as we have been informed, to sixty or seventy dollars. His story, his hymns, and his prayers, were uniformly the same. After having completed these, however, he was ready to converse and answer any question proposed to him. Every thing he said evidently proceeded from honest opinions. Never would he acknowledge that he had done wrong in murdering the woman; on the contrary he always appeared conscious of innocence and had at command many passages of scripture to justify his course. No doubt he was entirely honest; but he laboured under strong religious delusion.—He was a soldier in the Revolutionary Army, and drew a pension till his death for his services therein. The money he collected he distributed amongst his children, with the exception of what was required to purchase some few articles for his own use and comfort. He had occupied his cell so long, that he had got habituated to confinement and was as happy in his situation as the rich and free are in theirs. On one or two occasions his keeper proposed to let him out that he might see the village for a few moments; but he declined the offer partly because he believed this would be contrary to the strict letter of the law and partly because he was sensible he should return to his cell less contented than if he never had left it. His sense of justice was strong and practical; and his reasoning on other subjects than religion evinced a mind above the ordinary mould of nature. Had he been blessed with an education, and his mind saved from the shock of religious fanaticism, Mr. M'Causland would have been as powerful morally as he was physically. Even in his old age, after so long and enfeebling a confinement, his bodily strength was unusually great. He could take no exercise, except to walk across his cell a few feet lengthwise, which he did, regularly. Indeed, in all his habits he was very systematic. He had his hours for retiring to rest, rising, reading his bible and saying his prayers. In the coldest winters he chose no fire; but kept himself warm by exercising his body. After Mr. Dillingham took charge of the jail, his family taught him to read. This acquisition he valued highly, and did not misimprove it. But his Bible was his chief companion. This he read through in course a great number of times; but in all his reading he found nothing but confirmation of the course he had taken in the acts that brought him to prison. Mr. Dillingham's decease in July last was a great affliction to him; and may have been the means of shortening his days. He regarded him as his best friend; and when he was taken away, he seemed to have nothing left him worth living for.

On the subject of religion *alone*, Mr. M'Causland, no doubt, was insane; but not much more so, as we believe, than some others who pass for the most devout and experimental christians we have amongst us. These gloomy views of religion which are accounted by many as the most orthodox, seem to us calculated to produce that distraction which leads to shocking consequences. Mr. M'Causland was *very* pious—*too* pious indeed to make such a christian as is useful in the world. But his errours were honest ones, and obtained for him what he deserved—the pity of all who visited him. His case is not without instruction for all teachers and professors of a gloomy religion. Well would it be for mankind would they profit by it.

[From the Christian Intelligencer.]

AMERICAN S. SCHOOL UNION.

A CALVINISTIC NURSERY.

If any thing more were wanting to show that the Sunday School Union *is* a sectarian concern—the professions of its managers to the contrary notwithstanding—and that its great design is to be a nursery for the calvinistic church and to increase the numbers and strength of that sect, it may be found in the following which we quote from an address delivered by Dr. Griffin before the American S. S. Union at their late Anniversary in Philadelphia.

"The reports exhibit many happy deaths of children who received their first impressions at Sabbath Schools. Many others have been brought out of darkness and spared to be blessings to the world. One informs us that all who composed his first Sabbath school *joined his church*. Of 82 admitted to a single church in the year 1827, sixty-five were Sabbath scholars. Of one hundred received to another

church in a single year, ninety-eight were from Sabbath Schools. It was stated in your report of last year, that above 900 scholars and more than 1200 teachers had joined the church the preceding year; making the whole number of converts reported during the four years of the Society's existence, near 8000; and it was thought that not one quarter in the United States had been reported; leaving us to conclude that the whole number for four years had exceeded thirty thousand?"

That it is the object of this Institution to make converts to the calvinistick party, Dr.G. does not conceal. And he thinks the U. S. Government should support them, as our Legislatures provide for other publick schools.

"They are the Palladium of the civil institutions of our country. Why then should they not be placed on the footing of publick schools? Our country could better afford to endow them than to support courts and prisons. It could better afford to endow them than to pay the poor rates."

That is, the civil institutions of our country can only be sustained by giving our youth a sectarian education, and thus making them calvinistick church members. And this ought to be done rather than to support our courts of justice or to relieve the poor from their taxes. See ye not what this means? Can ye not discern the signs of the times? Are not the orthodox laying plans for having their religion supported by law? Dr. G. to give effect to his Address tells some wonderful stories as is usual on such occasions.

"If you would learn the full effects of Sabbath Schools you must follow the children home. There you will see a little boy, who when requested by an older child to carry home a board, says, 'I cannot, it belongs to Mr. B.' and when importuned to do it, ends the matter with this decisive answer, 'I cannot, I go to the Sunday School,'"

This, truly, is as sublime for the President of a College, as it is wonderful and strange in point of fact. But the following is, in verity, "miraculous." Only think how much better a "*thawed* Universalist" is than a *frozen* one! We wonder how long the animal kept without putrefaction after being "thawed"?

"Among other miracles, a Universalist, over whom four score winters had frozen, has been thawed into life. Near the spot where I now stand, was a widow with her seven children, sunk deep in squalid wretchedness; but the angel mercy of the Sabbath School visited her and lo five of her children are raised to life, and the whole family to comfort."

AN UNFORTUNATE SITUATION.

THE TIMES ARE OUT OF JOINT.

Messrs. Editors—I am an old man; and in my long journey through this world, though I have seen much to approve and something to admire, yet I have seen much more to condemn and to regret. In my youth I was an optimist; I lived in my own warm feelings, rather than in the world around me; unconscious how much my judgments of men and things were tinged by a happy temperament, and how little they were determined by facts as they really existed. The coldest, dreariest winter-scene, viewed through a sunny Claude Lorraine glass, is cheerful and warm. Such a glass is youth, before the chill of disappointment has dimmed its bright surface. Viewed through the magick medium, human life often wears a hue that is not its own: and the veriest moral wilderness is seen *en couleur de rose*.

I am an optimist still, if to think highly of our race's capabilities, and to augur well of man's future prospects entitle to the character. But if, to obtain the title, one must believe that all is as it should be, and that in society and its arrangements every thing is for the best, then must I confess, that, together with my youth, I lose also my opticism.

I do not assert that men *might not become* all that the optimist conceives them; I only say that *they are not;* and when the young optismist attains my years, he will probably say so too. I have heard many hypotheses proposed as explanations of the anomaly which man, in his social capacity, exhibits; a being who seems born to so much, yet living for so little. And, at different periods of my life, I have adopted first one and then another of these explanations. Now, in my old age, I doubt whether any one cause will serve to explain the anomalous phenomenon; unless, indeed, we generalize the cause of all our errours and blunders, and call it ignorance. Yet, when we have so called it, have we discovered much more than this? "that man suffers unhappiness, because he has not learned how to avoid it."

When I look back on my experience, and call to mind all the dishonesty and all the discomfort I have been condemned to witness in others and, at times, to experience in myself, I am disposed to conclude that a very great portion—perhaps the greatest portion—of the crimes and miseries which satirists have ridiculed and poets bewailed, is derivitive *from the unfortunate situation in which the most influential classes of society are placed.*

Among the liberal professions, as they are called, we shall usually find the most brilliant at least, if not the most useful talents; and brilliant talents seek and obtain a mighty influence in this world. The accomplished orator, for instance, is more than a sovereign; for he may rule the destinies, not of his own countrymen and contemporaries only, but, in a degree, those of all nations and of all ages.

Among the liberal professions, three classes obtain the chief rank; the lawyers, the clergy, and the physicians. Their influence—

that of the two first especially—is very great. And I think all three are very unfavourably situated.

The lawyer's professed object is to reconcile and put to rest our disputes; that of the clergy to improve our morals, and that of the physician to heal our bodies. Now, it so happens, that the lawyer is paid in proportion as we are quarrelsome, the clergy in proportion as we are vicious, and the physician in proportion as we are diseased. If we were all friends, the lawyers would starve; if we were all virtuous men, we should not require to salary clergymen; nor, if we preserved our health, need we fee physicians.

Now, is it reasonable to expect that men should honestly and zealously strive to deprive themselves of a livelihood? It may be commendable and generous; but, from man as we see him and know him, is it reasonable to expect it? Men must live; and men like to live well. It is surely a pity that the subsistence of any class should depend upon their neighbour's depravity, or their wealth increase with their neighbours' vices.

I speak in regret, Messrs. Editors, not in condemnation. The years have passed with me when I forgot, in anger against the criminal, the very cause of his crimes. If I feel less strongly than I once did, perhaps I judge more justly. As regards the professions of which I have spoken, I feel only sorrow that they are not better placed—better for themselves, and better for all around them. I should like to see them situated so that their interests and the interests of society at large might coincide.

I should like to see the lawyer paid in proportion as we were friendly and peaceful, the clergyman in proportion as we were kind and amiable, and the physician in proportion as we are healthy. I think we should see fewer quarrels, fewer vices, and fewer diseases.

[*Free Enquirer.*

ON ORIGINAL SIN.

Some particular texts are alledged, to prove that the nature of man is totally depraved by the fall, insomuch that all mankind, without exception, are now altogether incapable of any good thought, word, or action; and, moreover, that we are all subject to the everlasting wrath of God on account of the sin of Adam, I shall give a brief explication of the principal of those texts.

Gen. vi. 5. 'And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth; and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.' If we understand this passage literally, it will be contradicted by the character which is immediately afterwards given of Noah, of whom it is said, 'that he was a just man, and perfect in his generation, and that he walked with God.' But it is plain, that this wickedness of mankind was not owing to any *natural depravity*, which their derivation from Adam rendered necessary, but that it was a *voluntary corruption*, and had its rise from themselves only; for it is said, that 'God looked upon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.' Besides, this state of the world is alledged as a justification of the divine proceedings against them, whereas, if they had been corrupt by the *necessity of nature*, it must have operated as a plea in their favour, with that being who considers our frame, and remembers, that we are but dust. If he makes suitable allowance for the infirmities of our *bodies*, much more would he consider the natural and necessary disorders of our *minds*.

Job xiv. 4. 'Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.' This is a proverbial expression, signifying that nothing can be more perfect than its original; but Job is not speaking in this place of the guilt and pollution of man, but of his sorrows and mortality.

Psalm li. 5. 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive.'—This also has very much the air of a proverbial expression, signifying great depravity of heart, and very early habits of vice. That it was not intended to express a natural and invincible propensity to vice, is plain, because that would be inconsistent with the tenour of the whole psalm, in which the humble authour seems disposed to aggravate, rather than to extenuate his offences, to which this last mentioned consideration would have greatly contributed.

Rov. v. 12, 13, 14. 'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, &c.'

I think a careful and impartial reader will observe, that the apostle speaks not here of the death of children, whom he does not once mention, or refer to, through the whole argument. But he speaks of those who were not only *capable* of sinning but had *actually* sinned, and refers us to the Mosaick history of mankind in the ages between the fall of Adam and the giving of the law by Moses. Sin and death entered into the world by Adam, and death hath passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, consequently must have transgressed some law. 'For, before the giving of the law by Moses, sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law:' and the law of Moses they could not sin against before it was given. 'Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.' i.e. by eating the forbidden fruit, or violating any positive law of life given to them. What law then had they sinned against? Most evidently, the law of righteousness which God had written on their hearts; the sanction of which they

were also well apprized of (as the apostle speaks of the Gentiles in general,) 'Who, knowing the judgment of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them. Hence it appears that the apostle does not speak of the sin of Adam being imputed to make men sinners, and subject them to death; but of actual and personal sins, and of death as the recompense of them. Now look into the Mosaick history of this period, and we find before the flood 'that the wickedness of men was great in the earth.'—'The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. For all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.' And after the flood, excepting the faith and obedience of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, we have little else recorded besides the transgressions of the law of righteousness, sins which men committed, though 'not after the similitude of Adam's transgression.' As to the death of infants, God, the great giver of life, hath, undoubtedly a perfect right to resume it, whenever it seemeth meet to his infinite wisdom. But I do not recollect that the sacred writers do any where represent it as a *punishment* either for Adam's sin, or their own. In a few cases they speak of it as a punishment of the sin of their immediate parents, but then, as a punishment to their parents, who had sinned, not to the children who had not sinned.

Rom. v. 6, 8. '' For when we were yet without strength, in due time, Christ died for the ungodly.'

'But God commended his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.'

Let the intelligent reader judge for himself, whether the apostle does not speak here of the state of mankind (particularly of himself and the persons he writes to) before Christ's death, and the consequent publication of the gospel to the world, and intimate that the case is very different since that happy event? Doth he not plainly make the distinction in both verses, that we might not mistake his meaning, 'When we were yet without strength, and while we were yet sinners?' But doth the case continue the same, since Christ died, with those to whom the blessings of the gospel are imparted? then hath Christ died, and the gospel been published in vain. Yet some writers represent the state of those for whom Christ died, and who have received the gospel, as just the same, as to *strength*, with them who had not received it, and who lived before it was published. Surely, any of us would be displeased to have our words wrested to purposes so different from our intentions; especially, when we had endeavored to guard them from such abuse. God, our maker, hath given us intelligent capacities, suited to those discoveries which he hath made of his will, whether by the light of nature, or revelation; he hath given us also freedom of choice and action for the conduct of ourselves; he hath granted us the light and motives of the gospel for our fuller instruction and persuasion; he is ever present with us and ready to assist our sincere endeavours to know and to do his will; surely then, it is *unjust* and *ungrateful* to him to say that we are still *without strength*; and if we be sinners, it is wholly our own fault. As for the gentiles, even the worst of them, the apostle no where ascribes their want of strength, to their not having received from their maker sufficient abilities to know and do his will acceptably, but to their having voluntarily corrupted themselves and one another, and thereby lost the abilities which God had given them, and become dead in tresspasses and sins.'

Priestley.

The following article is taken from the Glasgow Christian Pioneer of June. The remarks in the first paragraph will not be new to our readers, but the subsequent interpretation proposed by the writer will be less familiar & is at least ingenious.—*Christian Register.*

A text which has been triumphantly appealed to, as containing a full proof of the deity of Christ, and even of his being God and man at the same time, is Philippians ii. 6 to 11, 'Who being in the form of God; thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, &c.' But if we attentively read the passage, we shall find, that even as it stands in the public version, it affords no foundation for any such opinion. Throughout the whole passage, Jesus Christ is as clearly and fully distinguished from God, as one being can well be distinguished from another; it is said, that he is 'in the form of God,' 'equal to or like God,' that 'God hath highly exalted him, and *given* him a name which is above every name,' and that his exaltation, and the submission and honour paid to him, are to the glory of God.'—He who is called God throughout the passage, is unquestionably the one supreme, self-existent, and eternal Jehovah; the person who was in his form, whom he had exalted, and who was honored only to his glory, must be inferior to him, and Jesus Christ always so speaks of himself; his words are, 'My Father is greater than I,' 'the works that I do are not mine, but the Father's who sent me,' 'I will pray unto my Father,' &c. Besides, the Apostle is here recommending the disciples to humility by the example of Christ, and surely his thinking it not robbery to be equal with God, can be no proof of humility. The 6th and 7th verses, as they stand in the public version, appear to me to be in direct contradiction to each other: 'he thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but,' as a consequence of his so thinking, 'made himself of no reputation,' is not, I think, sense. Let us see whether all these difficul-

ties may not be removed, by an impartial consideration of the text.

It is universally agreed by the best critics, that the word 'form,' means here only the outward form or appearance; and the words here translated 'equal with God,' only express similarity, not proper and full equality, and ought to be rendered '*as* God' or '*like* God.' The word here translated 'robbery,' means a booty, a prey, the thing seized upon, or else the *act* of seizing and plundering; the majority of expositors (for their reasons, see Belsham, p. 136) prefer the former meaning, and this is the way in which it was evidently understood by the early Christian fathers, (See Belsham, p. 138, and Clarke, No. 934). It is with great diffidence that I reject here the interpretation of this text, given by all the most eminent Arian and Unitarian critics, (who think that the apostle refers to his miraculous powers, when he says that Jesus was in the form of God, and adopt that of Mr Marsom, (See Christ. Refor. vol. ii. p. 457.) The apostle appears to him and to me, to refer to well known occurrences in the history of our Lord, and the following appears to us to be the true interpretation of the text: 'Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God,' at his transfiguration on the mount, when as the Evangelist informs us (Luke ix. 29.) 'the fashion,' form or appearance 'of his countenance, was altered, and his raiment was white and glistering, and his face did shine as the sun.' Peter makes his transfiguration an evidence of Christianity, when he says "For we have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known unto you the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father, power and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven, we heard when we were with him in the holy mount,' (2 Peter i. 16—18.) John who also was with him in the mount, alludes I conceive, to this circumstance, when he says (John i. 15.) 'We beheld his glory,' and as this was the only instance in which, in the presence of his disciples, he was announced by a voice from heaven, as the 'beloved Son of God,' he describes that glory as 'the glory of the only begotten of the Father.' This is what I conceive the Apostle meant, by saying that Jesus was in 'the form of God.' Peter, indeed, thought it would have been good for him to have retained that divine form; but the meek and lowly Jesus thought otherwise. He 'did not esteem this likeness to God as a prey,' as a thing to be eagerly grasped at or ambitiously retained, 'but made himself of no reputation,' or as the word would be more liberally rendered, 'he divested himself of it, and took upon him the form of a servant.' Jesus assumed the form of a servant when at his last supper, he girded himself with a towel, and washed the feet of his disciples, to which, I conceive, the Apostle here alludes; he assumed the *form* only, and was not, in reality, their servant, and he tells them, that he performed it expressly with a view of setting them an example of humility, 'If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet,' (John xiii. 14;) and humility is the very virtue which the apostle is here recommending by the example of Christ. 'And was made' or was 'in the likeness of man,' i. e. of another man, (See Judges xvi. 11, 17, where the same Greek word is used,) 'and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself,' still farther, 'and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name that at,' or in 'the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' God hath for his humility and obedience even unto death, exalted him to the reality of that glory of which he had only the form or appearance in his transfiguration on earth, and so shall we be exalted, if we attend to the Apostle's exhortation, and imitate closely this example of humility and obedience. Thus, this disputed and somewhat obscure text will, if it be so understood, form another beautiful illustration of the scripture doctrine of the inferiority and submission of Christ to his God and Father.

CHARACTER OF PETITIONERS.

There has been considerable boasting in the Orthodox journals, concerning the large number of petitioners, whose names were attached to the Memorials sent to Congress, on the subject of stopping the Mail. Compared with the whole population of our Country, these Memorialists are a small, very small number. It is not generally known, however, what contemptible means were resorted to obtain signers to these petitions, nor the manner in which Congress was imposed upon by the leaders in this business. A meeting, for instance, was called in a certain town: a half dozen individuals attended: they appointed themselves a committee to solicit names; and with young and old, boys and men, a list is made out. This is sent to Congress as a petition from the inhabitants of the town, when, perhaps, nine-tenths of the people are opposed to this business altogether.

To settle this question by matter of fact, we relate the following circumstance. There is a schoolmaster, in the town of Sturbridge, Mass. a very Orthodox man. After exerting himself, with little success, to get signers to the petition for stopping the Mail, he hit on the follow-

ing plan to fill up his paper. He took it into school, *and made his scholars sign it.* This petition was sent to Congress, as from the *inhabitants of Sturbridge.* Many petitions, we believe, were filled up by similar means. Now is not this deception? Is it not imposing upon Congress? Ought not Congress to be advised of the measures now put in requisition to stop the Mail? The name of the schoolmaster here referred to, is left with us, and any gentleman can know whom we refer to, by calling at our office. This fact was related to us by a gentleman who has recently visited Sturbridge, and who heard the schoolmaster avow that he adopted that expedient.—*Trumpet & Magazine.*

Chenango Association.—We had the happiness of attending this Association at South New Berlin the last week in August, and we can truly say it was to us, and appeared to be to all present, truly a season of "refreshing from the presence of the Lord." The congregation of brethren and sisters that met was overflowingly large. Nine ministering brethren (besides our venerable Br. Babcock, formerly of the Baptist persuasion) were present, together with a large number of delegates from societies; and uninterrupted harmony and joy seemed to pervade the whole. One thing alone seemed to be wanting to make our joy full—Several more ministers were wanted to supply the waste places of Zion in this region; and the Macedonian cry, "come over and help us," was urged upon the Association beyond its means of answering the demand.—It is sincerely to be desired that more laborers may be raised up here, or come from other parts to preach the word among the people. We hope to be able to publish the minutes of this association in our next.—*Evangelical Mag.*

"TRACTS BLESSED."

There is nothing more sickening than the accounts published by the Tract Societies concerning the successes which have attended the circulation of Tracts. One person was converted by the tract entitled "The well conducted Farm,"—another by the "Swearer's Prayer"—a third by the "Rewards of Drunkenness"—a fourth by "A Time to Dance"—a fifth by "The young Cottager"—a sixth by "The way to be saved"—a seventh by "Sin no trifle," &c. &c. We read of none being converted by reading the Bible, nor by diligent and serious search after truth. What person of good sense ever sat down to examine the *scriptures* for their *true sense*, with good helps to a right understanding of them, and arose with an impression that the doctrines of orthodoxy are therein inculcated. It is not the Bible, it is not christian honesty, it is not free and unbiased inquiry, but it is Tracts, Sunday Schools, Education Societies, et cetera, on which the orthodox depend to build up their system. The end is worthy of the means.—*Trumpet and U. Mag.*

SISTERS AND MOTHERS.

There are ties which, like the invisible ties of conscience, bind man to the world with kindlier affection, and are the last things forgotten when one leaves life.—The marriage situation *may* be one of pure and uninterrupted felicity; there *may* be no cloud in its whole happy horizon; it *may* be ever sunny, and flowers spring up in every season of life. But even these happy ones, who are in this clime of bliss, remember long and late the claims of a sister or a mother to their best affections.—In the life of the solitary and single, those who are said to be doomed to an enui loneliness the claims of a sister and a mother should hold strongly, not only upon their feelings but duties. Those kindnesses which men bestow upon their offspring and their wives, who possess them, and in them consecrate their best affections, are given by the unmarried to those who bear to them these sacred relations. In loving a sister there is none of that earthliness of passion which degrades the heart—in the devotion due to a mother comes none of the selfishness of men. The feelings inspired by both sister and mother are all derived from sources as pure as the divinity that inspired them.

Jewish Law.—The Orthodox are desirous that *Congress* should pass the following clause of the 4th Commandment into the Law of the land; "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; on it thou shalt not do any work," &c. We recommend, if Congress ever undertake this, they will commence with the preceding clause, as follows; "*Six days shalt thou labour.*" This would effectually put a stop to the idleness of many Missionary beggars, who are prowling round the country seeking their prey, and to the habits of those who spend half their time in attending Conference Meetings, Class meetings, Inquiry Meetings, *Whispering* Meetings, etc.

Unexampled Abstinence.—Mr. Reuben Kelsy, a respectable young man of Fairfield, in this county, aged about 25, is said to have subsisted on nothing but cold water for more than *forty days!* His mind seems to have been partially abstracted, and he has chiefly kept his room, apparently averse to any intercourse with the world, for nearly three years past.—The quantity of food taken by him for the last twelve months is supposed to be less than that required for the ordinary nourishment of an infant; but during the period first named, neither persuasion, threats, or force, have been effectual to make him swallow the least sustenance of any kind. Some particles of food, crowded between his teeth two weeks ago, were

discharged from his nostrils directly after, and no further compulsion has been used. He is described as wasted to a ghastly skeleton; still he is thought in a great measure to retain his senses, and to enjoy the benefit of sleep. This afflicting case is believed to be almost unparalleled, and has thus far baffled all the efforts of medical skill.—*Little Falls Gazette.*

When prosperous times come to the poor, they grow rich rapidly, because of their habits —when bad times come to the rich, they grow poor rapidly, because of their habits. By habits are meant those of application, expense, and respect to small earnings and savings. Habits, then, should not be much changed on account of prosperity. This is important to the man, and a blessing as an example. Luxuries and ornaments should not be considered necessaries, extravagance the basis of respect, nor idleness. How is it that children of the rich grow poor, and children of the poor grow rich.—[*Bost. Pat.*

REASONS FOR LOVING GOD.

He is our Creator and Preserver: He is the Author of every blessing which we enjoy, and he renders all our afflictions and disappointments the means of promoting our best interests. Our Creator knows all our infirmities, our proneness to err, and our appetites for injurious indulgences, and is merciful to all our faults. He punishes our sins in mercy—never from a disposition of revenge; but that we may be partakers of His holiness. Through the mediation of the Redeemer, He has given us the knowledge and the hope of a glorious and immortal life, and the interminable continuance of his fatherly kindness.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

INSPIRATION—MOSES, AND JESUS CHRIST.

"Through the tender mercies of our God, the day-spring from on high has visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness, and the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace. The day has dawned, and the day star has risen in our hearts."—ZACHARIAS.

The coming of Christ in his kingdom, at this day, is as he said it should be; as the lightning that shineth from the east to the west: the light of divine truth has shown from Bethlehem in the east, to distant Missouri in the west. "Truth is mighty and will prevail:"—"In thy light we see light."

I have lately discovered that among other errours I have been in darkness and errour, respecting the nature of Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as it is used or taught in the scriptures, and as some of my brethren may also have the same misconceptions, I have thought it my duty to hold up the light I have received on this subject, hoping my brethren of greater gifts and abilities, (if they receive my hint as light,) will improve upon it.

We have been taught that inspiration makes the subject of it perfectly free from errours and mistakes, thus confounding inspiration with revelation, knowledge and information; which are very different things, and which distinction has not been observed.

The literal definition of the term Inspiration, I think, is to inhale or draw in breath, the Scriptural use of inspiration of the Holy Ghost, or inspiration of God, is to inhale or receive the breath or spirit of God in our hearts: as we read, "the Lord God breathed the breath of life into Adam, and he became a living soul;" so also Jesus "breathed upon his disciples and said receive ye the Holy Ghost." When God breathes his loving spirit into our hearts we are then inspired of the Holy Ghost. By this we are warmed with love, quickened, and moved by the Holy Ghost, with faithfulness and zeal to speak and act in the cause of God, according to the light, knowledge and information which we have; but inspiration adds nothing to our stock of knowledge, but this is obtained by instruction, information, experience, or by revelation. When an ignorant man is inspired, he remains still ignorant as before, this does not enlighten his understanding, nor alter nor rectify his judgement at all. Now to assist us in the search of truth on this subject, let us look at some scripture characters, and see what shocking errours, darkness and mistakes, they remained still under, even when under the influence of divine inspiration; for instance, let us consider Moses the man of God. He says, "thus saith the Lord, thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy; thou shalt render evil for evil, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, blow for blow." Now was Moses correct, could this be the mind or command of God, or was Moses in an errour, let a greater than Moses answer for us? Jesus Christ says, although this has been said, by them of old time, yet I say unto you, love your enemies and do them good, return not evil for evil, but contrary wise, good for evil, blessing for cursing, that you may be like your father in heaven; See Moses also practicing this principle, and precept of his law. Was he right in being very wroth with his officers, for saving the women and children of Midian alive, and then commanding all the male children and their captive mothers to be put to death, saving only 'the female children alive'—and what a shocking errour, to command all the inhabitants of Canaan to be destroyed, men, women and children, and every thing that breathed, let not thine eye spare, nor thy heart pity them, but cut them all to pieces; again he says the Lord tempted Abraham to slay his son Isaac, and roast him for the Lord.—Now we know better—James, a disciple of Christ says, "God tempteth no man."—Again must we not conclude, Samuel the

prophet and priest of the Lord, mistook the mind and will of the Lord, when he commanded Saul to war upon Amalick, and to kill all men, women and children, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass, and in his zeal hewed his captive king, the delicate Agag in pieces with his own hands; and all the curses of David, can they be correct, or agreeable to the mind or nature of God, who has commanded us to bless and curse not—yet these were all holy men of God, inspired by the Holy Ghost, yet it seems they remained in darkness and shocking ignorance, notwithstanding all their inspiration.

But let us come to the new testament, and we find the Apostles of Christ, even after the wonderful effusion of the Holy Ghost, on the day of Penticost, still remained in the same errour as before, respecting the universal extent of the gospel of the grace of God.

Supposing Christ and the Apostles, sent to their nation only, and that it was sin to preach the gospel to any other nation; and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost did not enlighten them at all, and nothing short of a revelation from Heaven could open Peter's eyes; and his brethren still contended with him, and blamed him for preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, for going in and eating with the uncircumcised at Cornelius' house; but when he rehearsed and expounded the whole matter to them, then their eyes also were opened, and they said with wonder, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life; but this was not effected by inspiration; but by Peter's instruction: which I think is conclusive testimony, and we must admit that inspiration has no influence, directly on the head, knowledge, understanding, or judgement; but on the affections of the heart only, which it warms with love to God and man, and quickens, and influences to faithfulness, as far as light and knowledge extend.

And this I think will serve as a key, by which we can rationally account for all those contradictions between Moses and Christ, between the old dispensation of hatred, wrath, curses and retalliation, and the Gospel dispensation of love, and good will, of God our Father to all his family, to all men; Moses and the prophets were ignorant, they did not know any better,—I am not disposed to ascribe their errours to any thing worse than ignorance—the world was then in its infancy—it was then those times of ignorance the Apostle says, God winked at; But Jesus Christ has now disanulled this old testament law, of hatred, wrath and retalliation, which was against us, and has took it out of the way, nailing it to his Cross, and has introduced his royal law of liberty, life and love, in its stead. And yet my brethren, the greatest part of professed christians, even in this gospel day, choose rather to be the disciples of Moses, than of Jesus Christ; for it is obvious we cannot follow both at once, we cannot render evil for evil, and good for evil, because these two principles, and practices are in direct opposition to each other.

Now our old testament Saints, school divines, orthodox authours and preachers, have been labouring hard for centuries, to bring these two systems into agreement,—to amalgamate, and unite them into one rational system of Divinity; but they have utterly failed in the attempt, for they cannot form a union between love and hatred, blessing and cursing, any more than between light and darkness, water and fire, or good and evil; but they retain their opposite natures still; and instead of patching up an agreement, they have if possible, widened the breach, and set them at greater odds than ever; so that instead of healing, they have inflamed, and aggravated the sore, by making an infinite addition to the old system of hatred and curses, by extending it into future worlds, after death, that God our Father will continue full of hatred to his creature, of frowns and curses to all eternity.

Now this is outdoing Moses, as far as eternity is longer than time; for it is evident Moses' curses were all confined to this life, and this only, and not a syllable, or hint of future punishment; but this our orthodox D. D's. have added: Moses says the disobedient shall be cursed in basket and store, and in body and mind, with all manner of afflictions, in this life; but our old testament saints, Moses modern disciples, have added, that God our Father will not only visit all the plagues of Moses on the disobedient, but will roast them in fire and brimstone, both body and soul, to all eternity; or else give them up to the devil to do it for him, whilst he, his heart full of hatred, looks frowning on, and will uphold them in existence, to endure it to all eternity.

It seems as though our divines represent God as having two opposite natures, one loving, the other hateful, they say he has two aspects, smiling and frowning, and that I think may be two faces. Can one face smile in love, & frown with hatred at one and the same time, we cannot conceive it to be possible.

But will not God punish the disobedient? I say yes to be sure he will, and does punish them in love and faithfulness, for their best good, and they shall not escape, he will by no means clear the guilty; but will render to every one according to his deeds, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man who doth evil, for there is no respect of persons with God, and our good God and Father will not neglect to punish all the disobedient, so long as they continue in disobedience; but let us always remember he does not, and never will punish from a principle of hatred, or to gratify a wicked spirit of revenge, or retalliation, to injure or harm us. O, no, no, but always in love, as a kind father, with all the father in his heart, to

reform us, and make good children of us. As saith the Poet.

Good is Jehovah in bestowing sunshine,
Nor less his goodness in the storm and thunder,
Judgements, and mercies both proceed from kindness,
Infinite kindness.

The attribute of God's justice, flowing from the same beneficent fountain that mercy and all the attributes do, the heart and nature of Jehovah, it sweetly co-operates with mercy, in effecting the same benevolent purpose, the best possible good of the family, of God's whole family, of every member of it, without partiality; God is no respecter of persons—he has concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy on all; "O, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and goodness of God; for of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory forever, amen."

So then, it seems there will be nothing left for the devil, neither to, nor for him, but he is a poor devil—a vile usurper, and has no lawful right to any of the children of men, but has got into possession, by fraud and lying, has trespassed on God's property, and God will in justice recover them out of his snares; for they are all God's property, "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," and he will vindicate his right, and recover his own; his justice, strict justice calls for it, as well as mercy and goodness, and all his attributes, and let us all say amen. Now our modern disciples of Moses still continue, like their master, to attribute the most malignant principles and practices to Deity that ever degraded the human character:—such as hatred to his own children, vindictive wrath, wicked revenge, unmerciful cruelty, and retaliation; and these when reduced to practice by man, in imitation of this imaginary Deity, has been the cause, the sole cause, of all the wars and fightings that ever existed, which has filled the earth with blood and carnage,

Whereas if we would be the disciples of Jesus Christ, and like him never return evil for evil, blow for blow, but contrary wise, good for evil, that is if our fellow man injure us, do him a kindness, in return for it: this now would be truly God like, and Christ like, just as God our Father, and Christ our brother do by us, and this would at once put a final end to all wars and fightings forever—and what a blessed thing this would be,—brethren, let us try it—this is the very way love, and goodness, will finally overcome sin, and all evil.

It seems to me, that, in this gospel day, when the kingdom of God has come with such power we have no cloak for remaining Moses' disciples any longer—we cannot plead ignorance as in the old, early dark ages: Our Lord says blessed are your eyes, and ears, for ye see and hear those things which many prophets and wise men desired to see and hear, and did not—again, he says the least in the kingdom of heaven (that is the gospel day,) is greater than John the Baptist, and he was equal to any of the prophets—that is, the least christian is blest with greater light and knowledge, than Moses, David or Solomon, or any of the prophets. The light of the moon has become as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun, seven fold, then let us walk as children of the light and of the day.

But to conclude: We have already said, there is such a radical difference in the nature of love, and hatred, that they cannot dwell together, in one heart, person, family, neighbourhood or kingdom in peace, but hatred will be always at enmity with love, as fire and water, and the evil principle will continue to rage and fight against goodness, until one, or the other will be wholly exterminated, for they cannot both stand.

Now what a desperate thing—what an awful thing it would be, if the evil principle hatred should prevail, and get the victory over love and goodness; imagine for a moment the principle, hatred, having destroyed all love and goodness, out of God's fair creation, wandering solitary, in eternity, like the roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour; the kingdom of God all gone to rack and ruin, desolation, and distraction; for a kingdom thus divided cannot stand—either it, or the evil faction must ultimately fall.

But supposing, as our school divines say, this evil principle hatred and wrath, shall not wholly prevail over all goodness and love; but shall only maintain its ground, and divide the kingdom, so as to share the greatest part, and thus keep up the war and broil, to all eternity, in God's kingdom, in his family, in his presence. Now this seems to me would be a miserable, disagreeable state of things—why it would be worse than an everlasting Indian war, and that is bad enough, God knows—O! no, no, God forbid;—yes, my brethren, and he will forbid—for blessed be God, we know and are assured by the Lord Jesus, and by the word of his grace, that love and goodness will ultimately overcome hatred and all evil.

God is love, God is Almighty,
Almighty love can all things do,
Take sin away, destroy the devil,—
Kill death and conquer sinners too.

Yes, my brethren love, love Almighty reigns, and will go on conquering and to conquer, until there shall be no evil left to interrupt the peace and harmony of God's family forever.—And then O, what a blessed family, our great and good God and Father will have—every heart full, running over, with love, joy, peace and gratitude—lighting up every countenance into cheerful smile—and our kind Father smiling in love on all his happy family—then will the Lord God fulfil his promise, he will wipe the tears from off all faces, and from every eye. —AMEN. C.

Troy, Sept. 1829.

Poetick Department.

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

AND THEY SUNG A NEW SONG.

Now begin the pleasing story,
That will never have an end,
Sing the love the grace and glory
Of the dying sinner's friend.

Sing love's great Pacific ocean,
How the living fountains spring,
Watering all God's great plantation,
Making all his creatures sing.

Sing God's great high-way completed,
The labour of Almighty love;
Leading from sin and death's dark regions,
Up to the blissful climes of love.

Come dear souls, would you see Jesus,
Would you view his lovely face;
Let me introduce him to you,
Lead you to his kind embrace.

See him waiting to receive you,
Hark, he calls you to his breast;
Come to me ye heavy laden,
Weary come I'll give you rest.

See the Son of God descending,
From his radiant throne of bliss,
To suffer, bleed and die for sinners;
Was there ever love like this?

This is love that conquers hatred,
Evil it overcomes with good,
By this the hardest heart is melted,
And is reconciled to God.

Look from earth's remotest regions,
Vilest sinner look to him,
He will give you life eternal,
He will take away your sin.

See in him the bright resemblance
Of his father's glorious face,
Th' express image of his person,
Full of truth and full of grace.

God so lov'd our world of sinners,
While we yet were in our sin,
He gave his Son from sin to save,
And reconcile the world to him.

From his father's loving bosom,
Lo! he visits sinful earth,
He came to seek and save lost sinners,
Came to give us the new birth.

He has loved us and will wash us,
From our sins in his own blood,
Lead us to the kind embraces,
Of our father and our God.

From what source what living fountain
Flows this love in tears and blood,
Whence but from that boundless ocean,
In the bosom of our God.

From this overflowing fountain,
The streams of love forever spring,
Watering all God's holy mountain,
Love that makes the angels sing.
Watering all God's whole creation,
Love that makes poor sinners sing.

Now the heavenly hosts forever
Gaze and wonder and adore,
Love to enemies was nev'r
Known, nor sung in heaven before.
First-born sons of th' morning never
Saw so much of God before.

God is love, God is Almighty,
Almighty love can all things do,
Take sin away, destroy the devil,
Kill death and conquer sinner, too.

When shall we join the love wash'd—millions
Singing round the throne above,
Sing our souls away into this
Ocean of eternal love. C.

Troy, April, 1829.

FEATS OF DEATH.

I have passed o'er the earth in the darkness of night,
I have walked on the wild winds in the Morning's
broad light;
I have paused o'er the bower where the infant lay
sleeping,
And I have left a fond mother in sorrow and weeping.

My pinion was spread, and the cold dew of night
Which withers and moulders the flower in its light,
Fell silently o'er the warm cheek in its glow,
And I left it there blighted, and wasted and low;
I cull'd the fair bud as it danced in its mirth,
And I left it to moulder and fade on the earth.

I paused o'er the valley, the glad sounds of joy
Rose soft through the mist, and ascended on high;
The fairest were there, and I paused in my flight,
And the deep cry of wailing broke wildly that night.

I stay not to gather the lone one to earth,
I spare not the young in their gay dance of mirth,
But I sweep them all on to their home in the grave,
I stop not to pity—I stay not to save.

I paused in my pathway, for beauty was there;
It was beauty too death-like, too cold, and too fair!
The deep purple fountain seemed melting away,
And the faint pulse of life scarce remembered to play;
She had thought on the tomb, she was waiting for me.
I gazed, I passed on, and her spirit was free.

The clear stream roll'd gladly, and bounded along,
With ripple, and murmur, and sparkle, and song;
The minstrel was tuning his wild harp to love,
And sweet, and half sad were the numbers he wove.

I passed, and the harp of the band was unstrung;
O'er the stream which roll'd deeply, 'twas recklessly
hung;
The minstrel was not! and I pass on alone,
O'er the newly rais'd turf, and the rudely carv'd stone.

[From the Albany Christian Register.]

THE AUTUMN FLOWER.

Its leaves were pale—e'en stern decay
Had mark'd the lonely flower;
And borne its glittering charms away,
The victims of its power.

It seemed to mourn its early doom;
To weep with anguish sore,
Scarce born, and nurtur'd into bloom,
Ere its short life was o'er.

Lone wither'd flower—thy woes bespeak
The fate of Beauty's bloom,—
The gems that deck her dimpled cheek,
Are trophies for the tomb.

And such alas! my fate may be,
My doom ah! who can tell?
The blast that wakes a dirge for thee,
May sound my fun'ral knell.

Insatiate Death may o'er my head,
His conquering sceptre wave,
The leaves that strew thy dying bed,
May wither o'er my grave.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.
DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1829. [NO. 21.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

FOR THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

Br. Brownson—Having noticed an article in your 19th No. on the "Mission of Christ," and a request from yourself, in the same number, for some one to answer the questions, What were the necessity and object of Christ's mission? Will that object be accomplished? and is the object ascribed to him in scripture reconcileable with reason? I take the liberty of furnishing you with this Sermon, in hopes that it will be a satisfactory answer to these questions; or at least that it may answer some of them, and so not be entirely unproductive of good. The subject is an important one: and although this sermon was not written expressly with a view to answer all these questions, yet the topicks embraced in it are intimately connected and ought to be discussed together. THE AUTHOR.

A SERMON.

[From the Evangelical Magazine.]

ATONEMENT—PUNISHMENT—FORGIVENESS.

BY D. SKINNER.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."—1 Peter, iii. 18.

There is, perhaps, no subject embraced in the Christian religion, to which more importance is attached, than that of the Atonement. And, we may add, there is none on which we believe erroneous opinions are more generally entertained than on this. How the Atonement is to be viewed—whether it is an act or dispensation by which the sinner is delivered from the condign punishment which his sins have demerited—if not, how a just punishment for sin is consistent therewith—and how, if the latter be inflicted, the sinner can be said to be forgiven—are questions which are necessarily connected with each other, and which the prevalent opinions of popular Christians have rendered it necessary to answer. To solve these questions, and to present the subject in its true and proper light, is the design of this discourse.

The popular doctrine of modern Christians, is, that the Atonement is to be viewed as a *satisfaction* made to God, by the death of his son, on behalf of mankind, whereby they are delivered from the punishment justly due to them for their sins, and God becomes reconciled and friendly to them; whereas without this satisfaction, they had nothing to expect from him but everlasting frowns and endless curses. Or, to use the descriptive language often employed on this subject:—"Man had sinned, and become infinitely guilty before God—our first parents had transgressed a law, the penalty of which was *endless damnation*, and thereby involved themselves and all their unborn posterity, (of which they were the federal head, or representative,) under the infinite and endless wrath of incensed Omnipotence!—The frowns of an angry God darted fire and indignation on a young but guilty world!—the flaming sword of vengeance was unsheathed, upraised, and "trembling in mid air," was just ready to fall with almighty vengeance on the heads of the guilty wretches, strike them from the face of the earth, and consign them to the flames of a *never ending hell!!*—when lo!—behold! a miracle of mercy on behalf of man—the everlasting Son of Jehovah's love, one of the persons of the adorable Trinity, interposes with the cry of 'Forbear, O my Father, forbear—let the guilty rebels live—let the whole weight of thine almighty vengeance fall on me—I will receive the uplifted sword in my own bosom—I will fully satisfy the demands of thine inflexible justice.' The Father heard—paused—smiled—accepted the condition—and in the fullness of time the Son comes forth into the world, takes human nature upon him, and in presence of the guilty world for whom he died, fulfilled his profered contract, fully satisfied the violated justice of God,

> —'Quench'd his Father's flaming sword
> In his own vital blood,'

delivered mankind from the punishment justly due to their iniquities, and obtained a reprieve—nay, more—a pardon for the condemned culprits, whereby they are again admitted into the favour and loving kindness of God; he having been reconciled to them by the sufferings of his innocent Son, who endured for man an amount of misery equal to that of the eternal damnation of the whole world"!!

This is a brief, but we believe, a correct representation of the views of the popular denominations of professing christians at the present day. To this view of the Atonement we object,

1. *Because it ascribes the most glaring injustice to the Deity*—It gives countenance to a principle which, if put in practice among men, would be unjust, licentious in the extreme, and fatal to the safety and peace of society. For what could be more unjust than to inflict punishment on the innocent, who has never offended, when it has been deserved only by the guilty? What could be more licentious in its tendency, than to let the sinner, hardened in

crime, go unpunished? or what would tend more to encourage transgressors to go on in iniquity, than to convince them that they might escape all punishment for sin, and that the punishment which *they* deserved would be inflicted on a *substitute*?

2. We object to this view of the Atonement, because *it is absurd in the extreme, and perfectly irreconcileable in itself.* First; it is absurd in the extreme, inasmuch as it attributes a power and efficacy to the sufferings of Christ, abstractly, or in themselves considered, which they never did and never can possess. We do by no means deny the efficacy and benefits of the sufferings of Christ; but we do not understand and apply them in the sense above described. For what benefit, we would ask, can the sufferings of an innocent person be—in themselves considered—to a hardened and guilty sinner? Do they soften his heart? Do they subdue his propensity to sin? Do they reform his life? In short, do they make him a better man? Not in the least, that we can see. Let us suppose a case:—Here is a criminal condemned to suffer imprisonment, and perform hard labour in the state prison, for the term of five years—a substitute comes forward and offers his services to suffer the imprisonment, and perform the labour for him, and let the culprit go unpunished. Would this, think you, reform the criminal, or be of any moral advantage to him? or would it render society any more safe from his future depredations? Answer, No. Then the doctrine of substitution, in this view of it, is not only licentious in its tendency, but entirely destitute of any moral advantage to the criminal. Secondly, it is irreconcileable with itself, as held by its advocates, who are generally Trinitarians, and hold that the Son who suffered the penalty of the law, is the same eternal and almighty Jehovah who demanded and received the satisfaction! However they may attempt to hide or get rid of the absurdity of this hypothesis, it amounts to precisely this:—that the creature had become infinitely guilty, and the justice of God could not be satisfied unless an infinite penalty was inflicted; or, in other words, the creature had contracted a debt to an infinite amount, and was unable to pay any part of it—God was dreadfully incensed against the criminal, and determined the full penalty should be suffered—his justice would relinquish not one iota of the infinite debt that was due—the debtor could pay nothing—and so God determined to suffer the penalty himself, which his *own* vengeance demanded! and to pay the debt himself, which he himself, (or his inflexible justice,) exacted, or would not allow to be forgiven!! Thus we see this view of the subject is irreconcileable with itself.

3. We object to this view of the Atonement, because *it is degrading to the Divine benevolence, and detracts from the mercy of God; and consequently is unfavourable to gratitude, piety, and devotion.* For if God would not receive us into his divine favour, without the most dreadful sufferings of an innocent being (for Trinitarians can make more than one being in the Godhead whenever they choose,) where is there any just ground or cause why we should love him, or feel any gratitude towards him? For *he* has relinquished none of the debt—it has all been paid; he has remitted none of the penalty—it has all been suffered by an innocent person in our stead. Why then love, or feel gratitude to God? But there is another trait in this doctrine, which is, if possible, still more derogatory to the Divine character than that already named. The advocates for the system under examination generally maintain, that, notwithstanding the debt has been fully cancelled, and the full weight of the penalty endured by a substitute, for all mankind, yet the demand is still in full force, and the penalty, in a great variety of instances, will be again inflicted on the actual transgressor. Now that this theory reflects dishonour in the highest degree on the Divine character, is evident. For if the infinite debt has been *paid* to the Father by the Son, as a substitute for us, is it not dishonourable in the Father, again to exact it of *us*? But if, by the substitution, the demand has simply been *transferred* from the Father to the Son, (here two distinct beings are again supposed,) and the Son still holds the demand in full force against us, as the Father did at first, then we ask, wherein have mankind been benefitted by Christ's paying the penalty? And again, in what light does this present the character, both of the Father and the Son, for one to inflict, and the other to endure, infinite misery, when in fact they both saw that man would not be released from his obligations, or benefitted in the least by the act; but that there should be simply a *transfer* of claim from one to the other? And if the Father could not forgive without doing violence to justice, neither could the Son; for the obligation and the claim is the same in both cases. But that the Father is not influenced by the death or sufferings of his Son, or by any other external cause, is clearly proved by scripture. God says, (Isaiah xliii 25,) "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions, FOR MINE OWN SAKE; and will not remember thy sins."

4. We object to this view, because *it represents God as a changeable being;* as first hating and then loving, his sinful creatures; as having been once an enemy, irreconciled to them, and afterwards becoming a friend and reconciled to them; and that, too, from a motive which would dishonour any being he has ever created. We read that God "is of ONE *mind, and none can turn him;*"—that he is "*without variableness, or shadow of turning.*"

5. Because no law ever existed—at least none has ever been made known to man—

whose penalty was that which this theory supposes. We challenge the whole body of the advocates of this theory to point out one particle of evidence in divine revelation, that God ever threatened Adam and all his posterity, or any one of them, with *endless damnation*, or that any one of them ever did or ever will incur such a penalty. It is therefore folly to talk about Christ's suffering, as a substitute for man, a penalty that was never threatened against, nor incurred by the latter.

6. Because, allowing this penalty had been incurred by man, it is impossible in the nature of things that Christ should have endured the full weight of it in his own person, on the cross, or indeed during his whole life. For the penalty is said to be *endless damnation for all mankind*. Did he endure an amount of misery equal to this? Certainly not. For Trinitarians themselves will not allow that the Deity himself suffered—nothing but the humanity of Jesus suffered on the cross, according to their own views. Christ, then, must suffer as many eternities of misery as there ever were and will be individuals in the human family, in order to suffer the full amount of the penalty said to have been incurred.

7. Because all those passages of scripture that the advocates of this system commonly adduce in support of the doctrine of substitution, are either erroneously translated, or highly figurative passages, used in accordance with the Hebrew manner of speaking, and the customs of almost all the oriental nations at the time the scriptures were written. And those passages that speak on the subject in plain, unambiguous terms, without any metaphor or figure, are directly opposed to the doctrine of substitution. *e. g.* The following: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "Every one shall die for his OWN iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, HIS teeth shall be set on edge." "The son shall not die for the father, nor the father for the son." "But HE *that doeth wrong shall receive* for the wrong that he hath done." God, "without respect of persons, judgeth according to every man's work." "Who will render to every man according as his work shall be."

Having stated some of the most prominent objections that present themselves to our mind against the popular doctrine of the Atonement, we shall now proceed to state what we conceive to be the true doctrine in relation to this subject.

The word, *Atonement*, is found but once in all the New Testament: and then it is not said to be received by *God* as a satisfaction for sin, but is said to be received by *man;* and signifies simply, *reconciliation*. See Rom. v, 11. "But we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the *atonement*," (or reconciliation.) The Greek word *katallage*, here rendered *atonement*, is in all other places in the N. T. uniformly rendered *reconciliation*. So also the verb, *katallasso*, corresponding therewith, is uniformly rendered *to reconcile;* and might be rendered, *to atone*, with the same propriety that *katallage* is here rendered *atonement*. See for example a verse where both the participle and noun occur: 2d Cor. v. 19, "To wit, that God was in Christ, *kosmon katallasson eauto*, atoneing (reconciling) the world unto himself: not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us, *ton logon tes katallages*, the word of atonement," (reconciliation.)

Atonement, or reconciliation, is necessary on the part of man; but it is not necessary on the part of God. God is not, and never was, irreconciled to man. If he were, he never could become reconciled, without an infinite change taking place in his nature, which can never be. Man is the only irreconciled party, the only being that needed or required the atonement: and all that he ever did or ever will need, is, to be reconciled to God, who ever was and ever will be his unchanging Friend.

"If this is the light in which the atonement is to be viewed, pray tell us," says the reader, "how are we to consider the mission, sufferings, and death of Christ—what their object—how efficacious—how beneficial to mankind?"

1. *The mission of Christ.* The principal object of his mission was, to instruct and enlighten mankind—to teach them the true and amiable character of God; that they might be reconciled to him—in short, it was to "bear witness unto the truth," that man might "believe the truth" and be "made free" and "sanctified" thereby. Jesus says, (John xviii; 37,) "to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." Again he says, "believe the truth, and the truth shall make you free:" and again, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth."

2. *The sufferings of Christ*—were incidental to the circumstances and object of his mission; but were not without their benevolent design and beneficial effects. He, not only, thereby *sealed* the testimony that he bore to the truth, with his *own blood*, but exhibited the benevolence, and commended the love, of that God, whose son and messenger he was, to a sinful and unreconciled world; and proved that his "love was stronger than death," that "many waters could not quench it, nor the floods drown it;" designing, by a display of the benevolence of heaven, to reconcile man to his Father and his God. Here was no display of the Divine wrath, no exhibition of the vindictive fury of an angry God, to satisfy the demands of his inflexible justice by inflicting infinite misery on an innocent Son, in order to avenge himself for the sins of a guilty world. The sufferings of Christ were not *demanded* by God, as a satisfaction to his justice, on account of the sins of

man; but *exhibited by* him, as an evidence of his love to man. "For God commendeth his love to us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom. v; 8. "For God so loved the world, (he was not so *angry at it*, but he so *loved* it,) that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life.—For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." John iii; 16, 17. Look to the life, the ministry, the miracles, and the sufferings of Christ, from the beginning to the end—and nothing is seen throughout, but one continued display of unearthly *love* and *mercy* to the children of men.

3. *The death of Christ.*—This was necessary, not only to seal with his own blood the testimony that he bore, but more especially, and principally, that the power of God might be displayed in his resurrection, and life and immortality brought to light; thereby proving the divinity of his mission and the truth of his doctrine, and giving to man the hope of life and immortal felicity beyond the confines of the dreary tomb. Without this, dark and dreary were the pilgrimage of man's life, and his end still more gloomy and sad. Perpetual darkness would hover over the region of the grave, blacker than the rayless meridian of midnight gloom. But through the death and resurrection of Christ, a light, more brilliant than the mid-day sun, has dawned on the night of the tomb.—The splendour of Heaven's eternal glory has burst athwart the darkness of the grave, dissipated the gloom of death, and given to man, a hope, big with immortality, that is, as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast—Death is swallowed up in the victory of Life, and tears wiped from the weeping eyes of all humanity.

These were the momentous objects of the mission, sufferings, and death of Christ—objects infinitely worthy of the benevolence of God, the mediation of his Son, and the admiration and joy of humanity—to *enlighten mankind, reconcile them to God, and give them the hope of life and immortality.*

It will here be proper to notice some expressions in scripture, that have commonly been understood to favour the doctrine of substitution, or the popular views of Atonement, as contradistinguished from the view we have just taken of the subject. We shall therefore quote a few of these passages, and paraphrase them, in order to give the sense in which we understand them.

St. Peter says, in the language of our text, "Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God," &c. That is, Christ being just, hath once suffered in consequence of the sins, and *in behalf* of the unjust, that by his mediation he might reconcile and bring them to God. St. Paul says, (2d Cor. v; 21,) "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." That is, he hath permitted him, who never committed any sin, to be accounted and *treated as a sinner*, that we might thereby be convinced of our sins, (Jude 15,) reconciled to God, and conformed to his righteousness. Isa. liii; 4. "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows," &c. See this explained, Matt. viii, 16, 17. "And he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, himself took our infirmities and bear our sicknesses." The removal, by Christ, of the *natural* evils and maladies to which mankind were subject, was a beautiful representation of his office and labors, in removing their *moral* maladies, by enlightening their minds and reforming their lives. The next verse in this chapter is considered one of the strongest texts in the whole Bible in favour of the popular doctrine of substitution: "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we were healed." We may thus paraphrase these words: He was wounded in consequence of our transgressions, he was bruised on account of our iniquities: he endured the chastisement consequent upon his undertaking to effect our peace, and though he suffers many stripes, yet by his labours are we healed. Though the above language is highly figurative, as are many other texts relating to the same subject, yet we think we have given the sense intended by the inspired writer.—This will appear further obvious by considering the 11th verse, which declares that "by his *knowledge* shall my righteous servant justify many," (or *the multitude;*) *i. e.* By the knowledge which he will impart, he shall bring them to justification; "for he shall bear their iniquities;" *i. e.* remove them; the same as his bearing their sicknesses, signified his removing them.

If any one complains of the liberty we have taken with these texts, in order to have their meaning comport with those that are plain and strictly literal, let him be reminded that it is a liberty which we feel bound to use, and one which he himself uses with many passages of scripture, particularly such as the following: "I am the bread of life." "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.—He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." "Verily I say unto you, except *ye eat the flesh* of the Son of man, and *drink his blood*, ye have no life in you." Now no one, unless it be the Roman Catholic, understands these texts literally; and we doubt very much whether *he* does, strictly speaking. Hence we conceive that we have not only a *right*, but that it is our

bounden *duty*, to explain scripture by scripture, and to use the rational facultjes God has given us, in order to make the scriptures harmonize throughout in all their parts.

When we read that "Christ *died* FOR us," we are not to understand the word *for* as denoting *substitution*, *i. e. in room* or *stead* of us; any more than we are to understand the word *for* in this sense, in Heb. vi, 20: "Whither the forerunner is *for* us entered," &c. If we are to understand the phrases, "Christ died for us," "he suffered for us," &c. to signify that he died or suffered *in our room* or *stead*, *i. e.* to prevent *our* dying, or suffering the penalty due to our crimes; then we must understand the expression, "he hath *for* us entered into heaven," to mean, that he hath entered into heaven *in our room*, or *stead*, *i. e.* to *prevent us* from entering in! But no one will admit this sense of the word, *for*, in the last instance: then why contend for this sense exclusively in the former? It is true, Christ died for us—he suffered for us; that is, *on our behalf*, and *for our benefit*: the same as Washington and the heroes of the revolution, suffered *for*, or *in behalf*, (tho' not in room, or stead,) of their country; with this difference, however, that the heroes of the revolution suffered for one country only; Jesus for the whole world; they for a temporal, he for an eternal and spiritual salvation.

But all the sufferings that the heroes of the revolution endured, would not have benefitted their country in the least, had they not succeeded in subduing or driving away the enemy, and restoring peace to the country. So all the sufferings that Jesus ever endured, would, in themselves, be of no service to mankind, nor benefit our race in the least, should he not succeed in enlightening their minds, reclaiming them from sin, and reconciling the world to God. In the language of scripture, therefore, and in accordance with the common custom of Christians, we say, Christ suffered and died for us—that "he gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time;" that "by the grace of God he tasted death for every man;" that is, that his mission, sufferings, and death, were designed for the *benefit* of all mankind; and in the accomplishment of their object, he will bring all mankind to know and be reconciled to God, and enjoy his salvation.

To illustrate this important subject in all its parts, and bring it home to the understanding of each individual, we will introduce the following similitude. A Father has a numerous family of children, all dear to his affections, and beloved of his soul. But notwithstanding he is affectionate and kind to them, providing every thing necessary to their comfort and happiness, they—the first-born only excepted—all become disaffected towards him, erroneously suppose him to be their enemy, become irreconciled to his government and service, disobedient to his commands, discontented in his presence, and finally forsake him and their paternal mansion, and wander into a far distant and desolate wilderness, where the prowling tiger roams, and the lion, crouching, seeks his prey, where the hissing serpent winds his slow and snaky length along, and the hideous alligator crawls amid the oozy, vapid filth, where every breath is poisoned with deadly exhalations, and every step is danger; there their affections became more and more alienated from their father, they indulge in every species of debauchery and crime, and are in perpetual danger of destruction and death. The father sees his wayward children far from home and happiness, lost in sin, wandering in the perplexing ways of iniquity, and exposing themselves to all sorts of danger and suffering—he loves, he pities his deluded sons—he seeks to recover them from their lost condition—calls to him his only remaining son, the elder brother of his alienated children, and says to him, "My dear, my well-beloved, my only remaining and obedient son, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me; your brethren have all gone astray, they have together become evil doers, there is none that doeth good among them, no not one; they are alienated from me, not knowing how much I love them, and are exposing themselves to innumerable dangers and sufferings; Are you willing to go and seek for them in the wilderness? Are you willing to sacrifice your personal ease and happiness, and undertake to reclaim your erring and wayward brethren, and bring them back to my house, my home, and to happiness, and convince them that I love them still, notwithstanding all their disaffection and disobedience?" A smile of benevolence lights up the glowing features of the son, and with promptness he replies: "Lo, I come, as it is written of me, to do thy will, O my father. I am ready at thy command—I undertake with joy the important and arduous task of mediating between thee and my disobedient brethren, of convincing them of thy love, and bringing them back to thee." The son sets out on the important mission—he finds his deluded brethren in the unhappy condition before represented—he comes to the brethren that were his own, but they receive him not. He testifies to them the love of his father and their father, assures them that he is ready and willing to receive them again to the favours and hospitality of his house, entreats them to be reconciled to him, to forsake the follies and errours of their lives, and return to the bosom and love of their father. But they refuse to receive him as the accredited messenger of their father, reject and disbelieve the testimony that he bears of his father's good will to them, despise, revile, buffet and maltreat him, and at length, with the fury of demons, lay violent hands on him; and after beating him most cruelly—he, all the while praying for their happiness, and

testifying of his father's love for them—they pierce his tender side with the deadly spear, and lay him stretcht and bleeding on the ground! But by some mysterious, unseen hand, he is again restored to animation, life and strength. Still, undismayed with all their obstinacy, and his sufferings, he perseveres in his efforts to accomplish the object for which he was sent, demonstrates the good will of his father towards them, shows that he came not to condemn but to save, and finally succeeds in convincing them of their errours, in reconciling them to their father, to himself, and to one another, and brings back his long lost brethren in triumph to his father's house, where is peace and safety, and bread enough and to spare—he sees of the travail of his soul, and is satisfied—the pleasure of his father has prospered in his hand—and he beholds, through the instrumentality of his labours, his lost brethren found, the wicked reclaimed, and the wretched made happy.

In this similitude we see represented in miniature the whole economy of divine grace: the father represents our heavenly parent; the elder son, Jesus Christ; and the alienated and disobedient sons, the whole human family. If this representation be correct—as we believe it is, as far as the subject is capable of being represented by a similitude drawn from human events and circumstances—the following facts are made obvious:

1. God was never irreconciled or disaffected towards man—He ever did and ever will love all his children with an unlimited and unalterable affection—all the irreconciliation, disaffection, and alienation that ever existed, was on the part of man—Mankind had become alienated from God "through the ignorance that was in them," and by "wicked works." Therefore God never *required* the sufferings of Christ on his *own* account, or as a *satisfaction to himself*.

2. The sufferings of Christ were not intended to deliver man from *deserved* punishment for his sins, or as a *substitution in room* of the sufferings of man—for we see that the sinner bears his own iniquity—the alienated sons are wretched and miserable, and suffer every privation of happiness, so long as they continue estranged from their father's house, so long as they continue wandering in the wilderness, surrounded with danger, and so many tormentgiving enemies; and it is not impossible but that some of them may have received wounds so deep that it may require some length of time for them to become perfectly healed of their wounds, unless they have more than an ordinarily good physician. Hence the idea that all men do and must individually suffer according to the demerit of their sins, is not incompatible with the fact that Christ suffered and died for, or on behalf of them.

3. The *sufferings* of Christ were of no further benefit to man, in themselves considered, than as they served to commend and manifest the love of God, that shone through him, to the world of mankind. It is his *labours*, his *perseverance*, and the *success* that attends those labours of the mediator, in *enlightening*, *reconciling*, and *bringing man back to his heavenly parent*, which constitute the *blessing* to the human family through Christ. True, the elder brother of human nature has suffered much, very much, and endured the bitter agonies of death; but this was incidental to the arduousness of his undertaking, and to the ulterior objects of his mission; viz.—to reconcile his brethren, and "save them from their sins."—"For God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he hath loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; (by grace are ye saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus; that in the ages to come, he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus—At that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world; but now in Christ Jesus, ye, who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ—And that he might reconcile both (Jews and Gentiles) unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father. Now therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." (See the whole of this chapter, Eph. ii.) And when "the fullness of the Gentiles shall be brought in, all Israel shall be saved; as it is written: There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, who shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob."—Rom. xi, 25, 26.

The above obvious facts, that the evidence adduced from scripture in support of them, will serve as a further illustration of what was considered in the former part of this discourse, to wit, the object and benefits of Christ's mission, sufferings and labours.

It now remains to consider, for a few moments, wherein man needs a *pardon* from God, and how God can consistently *forgive* man his sins, if indeed the latter suffers a just punishment for all his iniquities. It is, in the opinion of many, one of the most difficult tasks in the world, to reconcile these two ideas: viz: that of a *just punishment* for sin, and of *forgiveness* of sin.

That every transgression must receive a "just recompense of reward," that "whosoever doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong that he hath done," is a truth that cannot be

disputed, without denying directly the testimony of scripture. And it is equally true that the scriptures maintain the doctrine that God is a God of mercy, "forgiving iniquity transgression and sin." Thus the Psalmist declares, "Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for thou renderest unto every man according to his work." God declares his name unto Moses; "The Lord, the "Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, *forgiving iniquity and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty.*" And Isaiah; "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her *iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.*" These, and numerous other texts that might be quoted, abundantly prove both a *just punishment* for, and the *forgiveness* of sin. But the inquirer will ask, "how are these ideas to be reconciled with each other?"

To answer this question, we will again refer to the similitude before introduced. Here we see a family of sinful and disobedient children, having wandered far from their father's house, in the forbidden paths of sin and iniquity, having polluted their way before him, and "pierced themselves through with many sorrows," in consequence of their alienation and sinful course: at length they are brought to themselves, see the folly and misery of their ways, and determine to return to their father's house. But with what feelings and temper of mind do they come? In deep humility, with shame depicted on their faces for their numerous errours and vices, like the returning prodigal, conscious of their own unworthines, they approach their father saying, "Father, we have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and are no more worthy to be called thy sons." So deeply sensible are they of their sinfulness that they do not even dare to claim the privilege of sons, but say, "do but receive and make us but as hired servants." How in this case does the father receive them? See the answer in the account of the prodigal's father. He does not wait till his transgressing children get clear home; but when he sees them returning, even while yet a great way off, he runs to meet and embrace them. And while they are confessing their sins, imploring his forgiveness, and saying within themselves, "How can our father ever consent to receive again into his favour such guilty wretches as we are? how can he ever forgive such enormities as we have practiced?" the father interrupts them with expressions of kindness and joy, commands that they be clothed with the best robes, that rings be put on their hands, shoes on their feet, that the fatted calf be killed, a feast prepared, and that all unite in rejoicing that his children who were lost are found, that those who were dead are alive again. Or, to appeal to every earthly parent in similar circumstances, bad as human nature is, would not every *father* say to his children in this situation, "my children, I rejoice that you have come home—I freely forgive you for the follies and errors that are *past; they* cannot be remedied nor recalled—all I ask of you is obedience in future—conformity to my law, and that, hereafter, you go no more astray—true, you have practiced evil with a high hand, you have *sinned much*, and you have *suffered much* in consequence of it—you have *reapt the reward, and eat the bitter fruit of your own evil doing*—Let what you have suffered for your sins be a solemn admonition to you for the future; and may it teach you that misery is the inevitable consequence of vice; that only in the performance of your duty, and the practice of obedience, can you find substantial enjoyment and peace, and that 'virtue alone is happiness below.'"

By the above representation every rational person may, and every *parent must*, see and understand, both how the labours of the Mediator in bringing back his sinful brethren of the human family to their Father God, are consistent with their suffering a just punishment for their sins; and likewise how *forgiveness of sins* is compatible with the latter.

In view of this subject, brethren, while contemplating on the unalterable benevolence of God, the condescension, the labours, and sufferings of his Son in our behalf, and the mercy of our Father in heaven, in forgiving our sins and receiving us, after all our wanderings, again into his Divine favour and the enjoyment of his everlasting love, let gratitude to God fill our hearts, love unfeigned inspire our songs of praise, and constant obedience mark the residue of our lives.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR.

HARTFORD, Sept. 29, 1829.

Br. Doubleday:—After taking my leave of you and your lady at Utica, I took the stage for this place at which without much vexation or delay save riding in the night and having plenty of rain I arrived at Hartford, of which I had heard much but had not before seen. The place is quite pleasant and doing some business. It is something of a religious place. Orthodoxy is powerful enough here, though I should think less so than formerly. Here is a very neat and convenient house belonging to the Universalists and a very pleasant society, apparently fast increasing under the well received pastoral labours of Br. Rayner.

You are aware that Br. Rayner was for a great number of years a preacher in the Episcopal connection, and was deservedly esteemed as a man of talents and piety. He is somewhat advanced in life, but still appears young—except in the maturity of his wisdom, and his extensive knowledge of human nature. It is

only about two years since he became openly a Universalist. He has done much for our cause in this state and is doing much at this time. He is highly esteemed.

I have preached two Sabbaths to the Universalists in this city, and was happy to find large and attentive congregations, not of merely curious hearers, but of believers in the impartial goodness of God. Universalists in the Eastern states observe the ordinances more than we do at the West. This is undoubtedly attended with some advantages. I wish men to learn to regard the substance as well as the shadow.

Universalism in the state of Connecticut is increasing, fast probably as the march of intellect warrants. People here can laugh at the "blue laws" as well as we at the West. I have been here too short a time to offer an opinion but from what I have seen, liberal sentiment is not more prevalent here than it is in the Western states.

The Orthodox tell strange stories about the Western & South Western states. They would allow that at Auburn and perhaps a little further beyond that lovely village, the people are civilized but they think they carry the tomahawk and scalping knife in Ohio and the great valley of the Mississippi, poor benighted region! You do not hug Calvinism so steadily as does the "land of steady habits," but never mind. The good folks here will soon over spread your land with tracts. Then you will hang your witches, and perhaps purge the land of all *infidelity*.

Wherever I see the Orthodox I am convinced they fear their days are numbered and that they are assured they postpone their doom only by extraordinary exertions. They are at work, but I trust it will be the mountain in the fable, a mouse is the fruit. But really I almost begin to pity the orthodox. They are sadly troubled, beset on every side, and no means but falsehood for defence. Well do they say it is a hard job to get to heaven, surely they take a rugged path. May God teach them better. They will never teach themselves.

I have nothing new to write. I start to-morrow for Boston, and shall hasten back to my warm hearted friends at Auburn soon as possible.

Yours sincerely, O. A. Brownson.

UNION OF PAPERS—NEW ARRANGEMENT.

The publishers of the Gospel Advocate, and Evangelical Magazine, have made arrangements for consolidating the two papers, after the first of January next. We believe the measure will be beneficial to the cause of Universalism. A greater quantity of matter, in proportion to the price, can be afforded without loss to the publisher; and other advantages will arise which will readily be suggested to the mind of the reader. We will add that we have the utmost confidence in the integrity and talents of Brother Skinner. His theological views are exhibited in a Sermon copied into this number.

Further remarks are deferred till the return of Brother Brownson.

U. F. Doubleday.

The Editor and Publisher of this paper has recently entered into an arrangement with the Publisher of the *Gospel Advocate*, Mr. U. F. Doubleday, for uniting that paper, which is now published at Auburn, under the Editorial care of Br. O. A. Brownson, with the *Evangelical Magazine*, and publishing both together in one paper, at Utica, from and after the first of January next. This arrangement has been for sometime contemplated, and we trust will be attended with the most salutary and happy consequences. The advantages attending it will be many and important. Though each of these papers is now tolerably well sustained, and afforded to subscribers at a very moderate price, it will appear obvious to all, that, were the patrons of both united in the support of one, it would be better supported, and could be afforded to subscribers still cheaper than either can be under the present, or hitherto existing arrangement. By this arrangement, effected with the most amicable feelings, no occasion will or can exist for any collision of interests, or bickerings of contention, between the different publishers or editors. One good paper, published in the centre of this large and growing state, patronized by the great body of the large and rapidly increasing denomination of Universalists, in New York and adjacent States, will be well sustained. For it will not only contain a correct journal of the proceedings of the various Associations and bodies of Universalists in this state, and a faithful summary of those of other bodies and the state of the cause throughout the country, but will also unite or concentrate in its columns the most of the talent and contributions of Universalist writers in the State of New-York. It will pursue an independent and straight-forward course in the inculcation and defence of the doctrines believed by Universalists to be plainly taught in the Bible, and sanctioned by reason, in the defence of equal, civil and religious rights and liberties to all, in the diffusion of knowledge, and the inculcation of those principles which will be salutary and profitable in society.

We are happy to know that this arrangement meets the cordial approbation of the friends of our cause generally, so far as their minds have been ascertained; and that they promise their influence and support in aid of the undertakiug. We have not yet fully decided on the size and form of the future work, but shall soon; and shall shortly issue a prospectus for the same. Our patrons may however calculate on an enlargement from the present size of the Magazine.

N. B. Mr. Doubleday, the present publisher of the Gospel Advocate will act as general Agent in the vicinity of Auburn and westward, in receiving subscriptions, orders & remittances, for the future work when the Advocate and Magazine are united; unless it should be more convenient for agents and subscribers to send directly to Utica. D. Skinner, *Editor of the Evangelical Magazine.*

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

MINUTES of the proceedings of the Cayuga Association of Universalists in 1829.

The Cayuga Association met agreeable to previous adjournment, on Wednesday, October 7th, 1829.

Appointed Br. JOHN S. FLAGLER, Moderator, and Brs. DOLPHUS SKINNER and NELSON DOOLITTLE, Clerks.

Ministering Brethren present.

John S. Flagler, York, Livingston co. N. Y. Dolphus Skinner, Utica, N. Y. Nelson Doolittle, Berkshire, Tioga co. N.Y. Jacob Chase, jr. Marcellus, Onondaga co. N. Y. Stephen Miles, Lee, Oneida co. N. Y. G. H. Ellis.

Names of Delegates.

David Merrick, Homer, Cortland co. N. Y.
Aaron Legg, Caroline, Tioga co. N. Y.
Robert Earl, } Marcellus, Onondaga co.
Nathan Kelsey, } N. Y.
George Standart, Auburn, Cayuga co. N.Y.
Peter Ladow, } Sempronius, Cayuga co.
Francis Wood, } N. Y.
G. H. Patrick, Geddes, Onondaga co. N.Y.

United in devout prayer to Almighty God with Br. Doolittle.

Received the credentials of Delegates, and letters from Societies in Fellowship with this Association.

Voted to receive the Universalist Society of Homer into the fellowship of this Association.

Adjourned the council till after publick worship.

After service met in council.

Appointed Brs. Flagler, Miles, and Doolittle, a committee to receive requests for letters of fellowship or for ordination.

Heard and accepted the report of the committee of Discipline for the last year.

Appointed Brs. James Foster, A. Green, and N. Doolittle, a committee of Discipline for the ensuing year.

Thursday morning met in council, and opened by uniting in prayer with Br. Flagler—Received request from Society in Geddes for the fellowship of the Association.

Voted to grant said request.

Application being made, the committee on requests for letters of fellowship, &c. reported in favour of granting a letter of fellowship to Br. Jacob Chase, jr. as preacher of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Voted to accept this report and grant said request.

Voted that Br. D. Skinner prepare the minutes of this Association for the press, accompany the same with a Circular, and that they be published in the Gospel Advocate.

Order of Publick Service.

Wednesday, A. M.—Introductory prayer, Br. D. Skinner. Sermon, Br. J. S. Flagler. Text, Matthew xviii, 3. Concluding prayer by Br. N. Doolittle.

P. M.—Introductory prayer, Br. Stephen Miles. Sermon, Br. D. Skinner. Text, Luke iv, 18, 19. Concluding prayer, Br. J. Chase, jr.

Evening.—Prayer, Br. Flagler. Sermon, Br. Miles. Text, Psalm 106, 3. Concluding prayer, Br. Chase.

Order of Service on Thursday.—Prayer by Br. D. Skinner. Sermon by N. Doolittle.—Text, 1st Thessalonians 5, 21. Closing prayer by Br. G. H. Ellis.

Afternoon Service.—Introductory prayer by Br. J. S. Flagler. Sermon by Br. J. Chase, jr. Text, Matthew viii, 11. Closing prayer by Br. S. Miles. Address to the members of the Association by Br. J. S. Flagler. Concluding prayer by Br. S. Miles.

Adjourned this Association to meet at Genoa, Cayuga co. on the first Wednesday and Thursday in October, 1830.

CIRCULAR LETTER.

The Cayuga Association of Universalists in annual session convened, to the Churches and Societies in fellowship, and to all believers in the like precious faith with us, whithersoever scattered abroad, sendeth christian salutations of peace, brotherly love and good will.

BRETHREN—By the grace of God our Saviour—the Saviour of all men—by the good will of Him that dwelt in the bush, and by the continuation of that parental benignity of which we have been made the happy participants and witnesses, we have been permitted once more to meet together in annual council, deliberate on those measures best calculated to promote the interests of our Zion, extend the cords of brotherly love, promote peace on earth and good will to men, and to unite our hearts and voices in publick and divine worship.

Our meeting has been distinguished with harmony and perfect unanimity. No corroding divisions, no root of bitterness has sprung up to trouble us. Our deliberations were in peace, and our worship unalloyed and undisturbed. Although, from the unpleasantness of the weather and bad state of travelling, a less number, both of preachers and hearers, attended than on some former occasions, yet our number has been respectable and our session an interesting one. One brother in the ministry received a letter of fellowship as co-labourer in the dissemination of the glorious gospel, and we trust will do us good.

In the sanctuary of worship, in the ministrations of the word, we were reminded of the necessity and importance of conversion from sin to holiness, from ignorance to knowledge, from darkness to light, and from pride to humility and child-like meekness, innocence and docility, in order to enter into the kingdom of heaven—a kingdom of righteousness, peace and joy in the holy spirit—which God has established in the earth by the advent and min-

istry of his Son: that all true believers who are converted and became as little children, "do enter into the rest" and enjoyment of this kingdom in the present tense. We were reminded that the spirit of God was poured out upon Jesus without measure, that it dwelt richly upon him, insomuch that he was annointed to preach the gospel to the poor, to bind up the broken hearted, to preach deliverence to the captives, the recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord; and that in the accomplishment of this object, and in the promulgation and ultimate effects of the gospel, every knee shall be made humbly to bow, every tongue to confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father, and the world's emancipation from the thraldom and bondage of sin and misery, and exaltation to immortal happiness, will be the grand and glorious result. And inasmuch as "the Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad."—in the works of creation, providence and grace, we ought so to live as to adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things, which can be done only by "proving all things and holding fast that which is good." We were also instructed that this kingdom of God was originally given to the Jewish nation; but, in consequence of their neglect and abuse of the same, it was taken from them and given to the Gentiles, and *they* "*cast into outer darkness where was weeping and gnashing of teeth*;" which alluded to the destruction of Jerusalem and dispersion of the Jewish nation, all which was strikingly illustrated by the parables of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Brethren in the faith of the everlasting gospel, by which life and immortality are brought to light, both ministers and laymen, may you be faithful in the discharge of every duty.—Are you successful and prosperous? be not lifted up with pride and vanity, lest you fall into temptation. Are you in adversity and tribulation? be not discouraged nor cast down, for greater is He that is for us than they which be against us. Do your enemies raise an imposing voice and threatening front? clothe yourselves in the armour of God and the panoply of heaven, and stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free. Does the reputed Orthodoxy of the day—the doctrines and commandments of men—frown and threaten, ridicule and despise? then unite all your efforts, concentrate all your strength, and call into requisition all your resources to check this haughty would-be mistress of the world in her extravagant and mad career, and you will succeed; for she is of human origin, and may be defeated by a judicious use and application of the sword of the spirit which is the word of God. Is your doctrine unpopular and reviled by men? so was that of our Saviour and its defenders in the primitive days of christianity: if you wish to make it more popular never forsake its standard, nor be ashamed of its name; but be open, bold and faithful in its defence and promulgation, and you will succeed in making it the very thing you want it, more popular; but you never can succeed in doing this so long as you are ashamed to avow, and afraid to defend it.

Finally, Brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might, always abounding in his work, inasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord. Remember that a virtuous and holy life will do more towards the upbuilding of your cause than all other arguments united can possibly do, without it. Therefore, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things. And may the Lord bless you and a ransomed world now and forever.

Per order. D. SKINNER.

THOUGHTS ON TAKING AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD.

Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.—John the Baptist.

And has the Lamb of God indeed undertaken the blessed work, to take away the sin of the world? Yes! glory and honour be to God; it is a blessed truth. John the Baptist preached so to the multitude, the Lord God also proclaimed this good news to the two first sinners, and also to Abraham. David also used to sing, "unto thee, O Lord, shall all flesh come; as for our transgressions thou shalt purge them away." And the prophets, "a fountain shall be opened for sin, when I shall take away their sins, saith the Lord." And the apostle Paul, "God in Christ reconciling the world to himself," and Peter, "God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you by turning away every one of you from his iniquities;" and "he has appeared to put away sin," and "unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins," &c.

Thus we find God, angels and men, the prophets, apostles, and saints, testifying this same truth, viz: that God has undertaken to save our world from sin, and for this purpose has sent his Son, to destroy the works of the devil, and ultimately to destroy death and the devil himself. Thus he has appeared to put away sin, and reconcile the world to himself—not to put away the wrath of God, and reconcile him to the world. O no, but to reconcile the world—not a part—some small part; O no, but blessed be God, it reads in whole numbers the world. And "God is the Saviour of all men," and "will have all men to be saved," and who hath resisted his will? Note, Jesus Christ is not called an offerer of salvation, in the bible, no, the Saviour of sinners, even the chief of

sinners from their sins; not to rescue us out of the hands of God's good justice, and save us from punishment, pain, death, hell and damnation, because these are needful discipline, and ought not to be taken away, so long as sin remains; no, but a greater salvation than all this, to save us from our sins—not to take away the condemnation of sinless infants, but the sin of the world.

And what a great undertaking this must be, considering how much sin there is in the world, and what a good and benevolent thing, when we consider what a bad and filthy thing sin is, and how much it needs taking away—and what a glorious work, considering what glory it brings to God and good to his universe; and what benevolence and condescension is here, when we take into view the high and exalted station, and character of the undertaker, the prince of heaven; who stooped from his throne of glory, he had with the Father, before the world was, and came down to sinful earth, to take away that most offensive and disgusting nuisance, the moral filth and pollution, the sin of the world; what a grand enterprize! the greatest, best, the most beneficial we ever read or heard of;—worthy the great projector, and undertaker—how far exceeding all the greatest achievements of man. The men of old undertook to build a city and tower, whose top should reach the heaven, but they fell into confusion and failed in their enterprize. Solomon in his wisdom erected great works, as the temple, cities, and a navy that filled the land with gold and silver; but these have all perished in the using, and scarcely left a trace behind: but behold a greater than Solomon is here. Hercules is said to have rid the earth of monsters; but the Lamb of God has undertaken to clear the world of more hideous and venomous, and even to slay the old dragon himself, and with more than Herculean strength to "heave the mountain of sin from our guilty world!"—Washington, the political father and saviour of our country from oppression and tyranny, was a great and good man; but behold a greater than Washington is here—who has undertaken to save our world from a worse than British slavery—to emancipate our world from the most degrading bondage of sin.

And indeed, so great is the utility of this work, that nothing will answer as a substitute, even were it possible to take away all pain, sickness, sorrow, death, hell and damnation out of the world; yet if sin is not taken away, this root of bitterness would soon sprout and grow, and produce all these evils again. But behold the Lamb of God lays the axe at this root of all evil, this bohon-upas tree, and is now hewing it down, and will finally take it all away, and consume it with the spirit of his mouth, and the brightness of his appearing: that is, he will finally cause light, truth and love to dispel all darkness, errour and sin out of God's universe forever, and goodness will overcome, and triumph over all evil; He the Lamb of God, has appeared in our world, to put away sin, not to put away the wrath of God; but to put away our wrath—not to screen us from the just punishment of our sins—not to purchase and procure God's love, and favour, towards us; O no, but to show us that eternal love and goodwill of God our Father which he had for us from eternity; not to alter or change the mind of God concerning us, for we are sure it could not be altered for the better, no, no, but to alter and change us from sin to righteousness—to reform and renovate the world, until we shall all know the Lord from the least to the greatest. But who is this Lamb of God, who has undertaken this great and good work? And now let the apostle Peter answer this great question for us, Peter said "thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," and our Lord approved his answer, and blessed him, and said "flesh and blood has not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven;" and this I think is sufficient to settle this question forever and will do it in every candid mind. But is the Lamb of God able to accomplish this great and glorious work? Yes, O yes, blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, he has given all power in heaven and earth into his hands, so that he is well able to go through with it, and he is certainly willing or he would never have undertaken it. So we are sure this blessed work will be done, and well done.

But how, and by what means will the Lamb of God effect this great and glorious work—the restitution of all things; will it be by wrath and terrour; by the fire and smoke of Mount Sinai; by the blackness and darkness and tempest; the voice of words; the lightning, thunder and earthquake; the sound of the trumpet louder and louder, until it made old Sinia quake to its very foundation; or will it be effected by the fear, or the power of hell-fire and brimstone? O no, no, no, all these are not sufficient—are too weak to melt the hard heart into love and repentance. The apostle says, "what the law could not do in that it was weak," God sent his Son the Lamb of God to do—and in his true character as the holy harmless Lamb of God he does and will carry on and accomplish it all by love, eternal, impartial, unchangeable love, for love is mighty to save; Solomon said love is strong as death, and by scripture authority, we can now say it is stronger than death, and will conquer and destroy death, and him that has the power of death that is the devil;—for God is love, and he gave to his Son a double portion of his own loving spirit; this induced him to yield himself into the hands of his ungrateful brethren to be slain. It was this ardent, everlasting love to his enemies, that induced him freely to endure the scourge, the thorns, the nails, and hammer—for he lov-

ed his murderers, and prayed for them to his Father who he said he knew always heard him; Father forgive them for they know not what they do. O! my brethren here is love indeed and in truth. Then was eternal fountain for sin opened in the heart of our Father and our God—that unbounded ocean of benevolence in the nature of Jehovah, poured fourth streams—rivers, whole floods of eternal love, enough to quench hell, kill death, destroy the devil, and conquer sinners too. O! my sinful brethren let us by faith look unto Jesus this Lamb of God on the cross—and it will take away our sins; look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth; behold the love of God our Father—the love and kindness of our Saviour, towards man, towards us appears—running freely from his head, his hands, his feet—gushing forth in copious streams from his sacred side, running warm with his life-blood from his benevolent heart; and say was there ever love like this! this is love that conquers hatred.

As nothing but light can dispel darkness, so nothing but love can expel hatred; what thunders and wrath cannot do, that is melt hard hearts into love and penitence, this love can and does perform; and by this the Lamb of God is going on conquering and to conquer; taking away the sin of the world, and will not fail till by the power of Almighty Love, all things shall be subdued unto him; until every knee shall bow and every tongue confess him Lord, to the glory of God the Father, and God will be all and in all; and then of course there will be no devil in any body for when God shall be all in all, there will be no place left for sin, death, hell nor the devil: but God will be all and in all forever.—Amen. C.

QUERIES.

What ought of right to be the great leading object of our pursuit, our chief good—the aim and end of all our labours and desires—the mark of the prize for which we run? is it happiness, heaven and immortal glory for ourselves? or the honour and declarative glory of God? Is it ourselves, or our God? or in other words, What is the right spring, or motive of action? is it self-love, or love to God and man? what should our first petition be,—happiness, or hallowed be thy name? And what our second petition; happiness or holiness? What ought to be the spring or cause of our chief joy and consolation; is it the prospect and hope of happiness? mansions in the skies and crowns of glory? or is it that the glory of the Lord shall endure forever, and Jesus crowned Lord of all? And if we adopt the latter of these petitions, that is the honour and glory of God, instead of our own honour, glory or happiness, then, would not happiness come fast enough, flowing into our bosoms like a river, spontaneously, without our seeking, striving or labouring hard for it?

Is happiness a cause or an effect? is God the chief good? or is there some greater good we may obtain thro' his means? what should we love and seek the Lord for? for his own sake, or for the sake of ourselves? that is to get happiness? Can we love one thing for the sake of another thing? Can we love God for the sake of obtaining happiness? or in this case would it not be happiness we love, and only want God as a secondary object, as a tool or mean to obtain our beloved object, our chief good, happiness? But if we do not seek happiness, must we not of course seek misery?—why so? is there no alternative? may we not love and seek the living God, our heavenly Father, for his own worthiness, and loveliness' sake, without the sinister motives of hope or fear of our own happiness, or misery, but leave these wholly to his wise and good disposal?

But does or can affliction or misery come from God? does it come from a bad cause for a bad end? or from a good cause for a good end? what does the rod of correction spring from, but the love and kindness of the parent's heart, for the best good of his child? What makes an action bad? is it because it brings misery, or the reverse, that it brings misery because it is bad? does bad fruit make the tree bad, &c. or only show us what it is? does the effect govern the cause or the cause the effect? What is it then makes our actions bad or good, right or wrong, if it is not the consequences that follow and flow from them?

Is there not an eternal standard of right implanted in every man's breast; called by some the God within, and by our good old friends, "the light within?" and are not all our actions right or wrong according as we square them by this standard, according to the light and knowledge we have of it, whether little or much, so that the heathen, the Hottentots have an equal chance to be good and righteous, as the most learned? Is ignorance the cause of crime, or the reverse? does it not always clear the person from blame?

Will men always prefer the right when it is shown to them? do men always do as well as they know how to? and if they did, would there be one rogue, criminal, or sinner on earth?—Is knowledge and instruction all that we need? the one thing needful, or do we not need the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the holy ghost, which God has given us, and without this love to God and man, are we any thing but an empty sound? and although knowledge, learning and instruction, are in themselves good and great things, yet without this charity, will they not always prove a great price in the hands of a great fool, seeing he has no heart to it? will it not always puff him up? and is not an ignorant good man preferable to a learned bad man?

Do not good actions always bring peace of conscience, and happiness to the mind? and bad, wrong actions the reverse, guilt and mis-

ery of mind? but do our right or wrong actions always have the same effect on our bodies as they do on our minds? do we not sometimes suffer, (that is temporary bodily) misery for, or as a consequence of well doing?

May we not say, all our sufferings are always, all of them blessings in disguise, that is they shall finally produce blessings, shall be overruled for our best good.

Then "be ye reconciled to God," to his good and wise government—his providences. C.

AN UNFEELING OUTRAGE.

To the Editor of the Gospel Advocate:

The following circumstances I presume are almost without a precedent in the dark ages of the world; for in those times men who were only guided by the dim light of nature, have not been found wanting in some degree of sympathy for the distressed. With them a child's grief for the loss of a friend & tender parent has been mitigated by the tear of generous humanity; and even a savage will blush to be guilty of wounding the tender feelings of the surviving children of a tender and indulgent deceased parent. But we are compelled to say that in this country (although humanity will shudder at the idea) there are those whose hearts are steeled with unfeeling barbarity, and in a christianized land, where so much time and money is said to be expended to christianize the heathen, and means used to soften their hearts to a feeling sense of affection for their brethren—I say, in this same country there are those who have slandered the dead and injured and abused the living. If you think the following worthy publication, you will confer a favour on the friends of the deceased who feel themselves very much injured, by inserting it. The simple facts are these:—A pretended preacher of the gospel and follower of Jesus of Nazareth, yea one of those who preach the doctrine of an endless hell to all those who he supposes are less worthy than himself, or who do not happen to pronounce shibboleth to his liking—this would-be-thought saint was called to preach a funeral sermon at the burial of Mr. Daniel Stickney, a few days past, in the town of Groton, Tompkins co. N.Y. His name is Marcus Harison, and is ordained over the church and society in that town. Mr. Stickney was a firm believer in the universal salvation of all men to his last hour, and during his last sickness resided with Mr. Jehial Bachus, his son-in-law. I would note that Mr. Bachus lives in the neighbourhood where the people are almost to a man members of H's. church and society, and the occasion of his employing Mr. H. was that it was an uncommonly hurrying time with the farmers in collecting their hay and grain, in consequence of the recent rains, and he was fearful there would not enough attend to bury his father decently, if a universalist preached, which was his choice had it not been for the above circumstances, as Mr. H's. church, many of them, are very violently opposed to the persons of that sentiment, and often treat them with the greatest degree of contempt. Mr. H. took his text in Luke 14th and 32d. After he mentioned it first, it is not recollected that he referred to it but once, but commenced with the most abusive language in stigmatizing the believers of Universalism and using all his powers in threatning, and denunciations in the most pointed manner, without mentioning the particular name of the deceased, and exerting his abilities to the highest pitch (he being very gifted) to injure the tender feelings of Mrs. Bachus, who was the only child of the deceased present, except a little sister of hers, 5 or 6 years old. If Mr. H. should ever see this, I wish him to turn to the 12th chap. of John and 47th verse, as he is so much in the habit of judging and condemning all those that hear him and do not believe all he says. The words are those of the Saviour, and I should think would make him blush at his former conduct. But read them, Mr. H. "And if any man hear my word, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world but to save the world."—Yet one would think, by Mr. Harison's judging and condemning, that he was commissioned some higher than the Saviour of the world. But to proceed, Mr. H. lives in the neighbourhood of Mr. Bachus, and visited Mr. Stickney several times during his last sickness and could not but have known his sentiments: for it is well known that men of his cast make use of all the means in their power on such occasions, and like wolves in sheep's clothing when they visit the chambers of death in that dark hour when heart and flesh fail, when the soul seems to quiver on the lip, this is the time they take to question them as to their particular creed or articles of faith, and if possible catch something that they can have placed in the Boston and Western Recorder. Mr. H. could not but also know that Mrs. Bachus was of a tender and delicate constitution, and that she was uncommonly attached to her father, and she with her husband did every thing in their power to relieve and comfort him during his last sickness, but this had no effect on the unfeeling H. but his conversation was too much for the bereaved and tender hearted child to bear, and came very near producing convulsions. She, however, mustered all her strength and made known that she could no longer bear the abuse of the unfeeling H.: He was accordingly requested to stop when he had perhaps got half through his discourse and after some hesitation, ended the exercise at the house.—The corpse was then taken to the burying ground and H. attended. The mourning child desired to stay and see the last services performed to her kind and affectionate parent, but H. pretended he could not be hindered any

longer and accordingly dismissed the congregation before the grave was closed and left the yard apparently in some degree of passion.—With Mr. Harison I have had no controversy, and as a private citizen I have heretofore had some respect for him but when he places himself before the publick, and is guilty of such conduct, I think he ought not to pass unnoticed. There are many members of his church who have my warmest regard, and I regret to injure their feelings as individuals; but I think myself justifiable in giving the publick some account of his conduct in this transaction as well as some others. I have been for several years acquainted with Mr. Stickney and believe him to have generally sustained a good character and think stood far above Mr. Harison's in many respects.

This same would-be righteous Harison, some time past, had his horse's tail and mane sheared off by some roguish boys in his neighbourhood, and after using every possible means to discover the rogues, to no purpose, he promised in the most solemn manner, if the persons who had done the crime would come to him and confess the deed, he would forgive them, and by this means obtained a confession from the boys. But contrary to his engagement, instead of forgiveness he immediately complained to the Grand Jurors of Tompkins County and had these two boys indicted.* I do not mention this to uphold such conduct in the boys, but to show that men of such sacred characters, and saintish faces as he puts on should have honour enough to abide by their promises, for appearance' sake, if nothing else. I mention this circumstance that the publick may know his real character. I certainly have not the least personal enmity against him, but sincerely wish he may repent and mend his life, and that his future conduct may be such as becomes a good citizen. Much more might be said but I use brevity. WM. S. CLARK.

Groton, August 14th, 1829.

* This man preaches the soul-chilling doctrine of endless misery, and tells his hearers that all liar's shall welter in the flames of an endless hell of liquid fire and brimstone, whose waves of melted lava roll to all eternity, while the vindictive justice of God shall dart his malignity without mercy on the guilty souls, and if this is his belief, he must think himself in a bad condition.

SELECTIONS.

UNPARALLELED OUTRAGE.

An article with the above title has appeared in the Religious Inquirer, giving an account which almost defies belief, of the brutal treatment which a young woman received from her own father, and he a professed Minister of the Gospel. To use the words of the Editor of the Inquirer,—

"The circumstances are briefly these: A daughter of the Rev. SAMUEL GRISWOED, an Episcopalian Clergyman residing in Winchester, (Conn.) expressed a desire in the presence of her father at tea-table to go that evening, and hear a Universalist Minister who had made an appointment to deliver a lecture in the neighbourhood. Whereat the Rev. Father made no objection at that time. When the hour had arrived at which the congregation were to assemble, the young lady, attended by some female friends who had called to accompany her, left her father's house, and proceeded a few paces, when the Rev. Gentleman came to the door and commanded her to return, saying that she should not go to meeting that night. She replied that she wished to go, and that "she did not think there was any harm in her going." She accordingly proceeded onward, when her father sallied forth and seized her with great violence, knocked her down, kicked her, inflicted several severe blows upon her head, and dragged her into the house with her clothes half rent from her body. He then took a horsewhip and beat her with that, till he broke the lash, and continued beating her until he broke the staff, (which was tough seasoned hickory) in two or three pieces. It further appears in the testimony, as we are informed, that persons in the vicinity of the house heard FIFTY lashes, as they judged, when becoming alarmed, they fled with horrour. It should also be observed that the daughter was of age at the time of this unmerciful treatment by her cruel parent. In the true spirit of a heroine she instituted an action against her father, which came on for final trial at the late session of the Superiour Court in Litchfield, and the jury returned a verdict of FIFTEEN HUNDRED DOLLARS against the REV. DEFENDANT.

The foregoing particulars we received from a gentleman of the bar of the first respectability, who was present at the trial of the case, and we have no doubt of their correctness in every material point. But the most singular circumstance perhaps, in the whole of this affair, is the fact that the defendant's counsel, knowing, probably, the weak points in the character of the presiding Judge (Daggett,) urged vehemently in justification of the offence, the daring nature of the deed *in going to hear such abominable preaching!!* This point in the defence was dwelt upon with peculiar emphasis. But whatever effect this appeal may have had upon the Court, the jury, it appears, were not so far moved by it as to be deterred from inflicting condign punishment upon the unnatural parent, and unworthy preacher of the Gospel of Peace."

No benevolent man can read the above account without being stricken with horrour. A father, a clergyman, beat his own child, a daughter too, in this cruel manner! Good God! can it be true? This is worse than the cruelty of the father in Exeter, N. H. and we thought

that deserving the highest reprobation. And what great offence had this young woman committed? Ans. She attempted to attend a lecture preached by a Universalist. Is free enquiry, then, so daring a sin in the eyes of the Rev. Clergy that it must be punished thus unmercifully? This clergyman violated the laws of the land, and is punished; but suppose our laws upheld such characters in their arrogance and wrath, what chastisement could we who are branded as heretics expect, save those of scorpions, racks, gibbets and flames? O thanks to kind Providence, we live where we are protected by the strong arm of civil power, in the full enjoyment of our religious principles; and we earnestly desire that the repeated instances which we discover of the disposition to deprive us of these privileges, may endear us more and more to the form of government by which they are secured.—*Trumpet & Mag.*

SUICIDE AT WOBURN, MASS.

A melancholy instance of suicide has lately occurred at this place. The subject was a young man who was attending the Academy in that town. The following remarks in relation to this melancholy event, are from the Trumpet.—*Gospel Herald.*

Our minds have been severely exercised by this distressing circumstance. When the hope of a widowed mother is destroyed, the feelings of the tenderest relatives lacerated, and our very land soiled by the blood of self-destroyed victims of orthodoxy, the heart throws off all restraint, and indulges in the overflowing grief which it finds itself unable to subdue.—There were probably three causes which tended to produce the death of the young man.—1. He was forbidden free enquiry. 2. He was made to suffer reproach for listening to the doctrine of impartial love. 3. Undue measures were used to induce him to take charge of a class in an orthodox Sunday School. His fear that orthodox doctrines are true, and the uneasiness the mind felt under these restraints, destroyed its equilibrium, and was the cause of the fatal act.

Parents! will you send your children for instruction, where they are exposed to such dangers? Will you provide no other means than those which are placed in the hand of your bitterest religious opponents? We urge you to think of these subjects, and do something before it is too late. Who knows but your child may be the next victim? Repentance will then be unavailing. "The prudent man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself." May it not be said in relation to you, "the simple pass on and are punished."

CAUTION TO UNIVERSALISTS.

We deem it a duty (altho' it is a painful one) to caution Universalist Societies against employing a preacher known by the name of Dr. James Priestly. Mr. P. was formerly from England, and we believe has preached in connexion with the Methodist Episcopal Church. He is said to be a man of excellent talents as a preacher. He professes to believe, and has for some two or three years preached the doctrine of Universal Salvation. He is, however, a man totally unworthy of all confidence and trust; notoriously addicted to excessive intemperance; (except at occasional intervals of sobriety;) and has in several instances disgraced and essentially injured the cause of religion where he has been employed. He is not, and *never has been*, in fellowship with the order of Universalists. And we would warn all Universalists against employing, or countenancing, or hearing the said Priestley preach, on any occasion whatever.—*Evangelical Magazine.*

☞ Publishers of Universalist papers are requested to give the above notice an insertion.

CONVERSION IN THE MINISTRY.

We are happy to announce to our readers the conversion of an Episcopalian Clergyman in the Province of Lower Canada, to the doctrine of Universalism. He was educated for the Church of England, and has always been a highly respected and highly useful minister in that Church. His name is CHARLES LEFEVRE, and he is at present, we learn, in Quebec, to which place he was summoned by the Archdeacon, to give an account of his sentiments. Since his mind was called to the subject, he has several times gone through the New Testament in Greek, with particular reference to the Universalian controversy, and is thereby convinced that the views taken by Universalists are correct. We are happy to add, that we learn from gentlemen just arrived from the Province, that he is a man of undisputed piety, and has been considered one of the brightest ornaments of the Episcopal Church.—*Trumpet & Magazine.*

SPIRIT OF ORTHODOXY.

A pious Deacon, at a Conference meeting, in the town of D********, about 30 miles north of Boston, addressed his auditors as follows:—"My friends, there is a new doctrine going about now-a-days. We are told that all mankind are going to heaven. But, my brethren and sisters, we hope for better things."—*Trumpet.*

The Rev. Henry Roberts, Rochester, is no longer an Agent for the Gospel Advocate.

As the Advocate is soon to be transferred, it is important to ascertain the responsibility of our subscribers. Those who have not paid at all, are therefore requested to make remittances as soon as possible. To facilitate collections, we will continue to receive $1,50 for the 7th Vol. if paid during this month, or so as to reach us in the month of November. After the 1st of December next two dollars will be exacted.

PUBLISHER.

Poetick Department.

We copy from No. 26 of the Critick, the following beautiful lines by *Hinda*, the gifted sister of the accomplished Norna—They are worthy a place with any of the effusions of the felicitous Mrs. Hemans.
[*Richmond Enquirer.*

MY MOUNTAIN HOME.

Come to our own bright home—
Sweet as the myrtle breath,
Soft as the rose-leaf, come,
To our fairy life and death;
Our life is rich as the bended vine,
And our death is as soft as the flower's decline.

Come to our clime of light,
From a spot so drear and dull,
The arch of heaven is bright,
And earth is beautiful;
To the fairy paths of our southern home,
To the citron groves and the fountain come.

"I cannot come to thee
And leave my mountain land,
Though the weary brow may be
By perfumed breezes fanned;
Oh, sweeter the air, though cold and rude
Upon this rocky solitude.

"For here my childhood hours
Have blithely passed away,
I could not sit in ladies' bowers
Through the free and joyous day—
Rather I'd listen to the cataract's voice,
And in the loud wail of the winds rejoice.

"And I love to stand upon
The high unsheltered rock,
When the clouds are sweeping on
To the mighty thunder shock—
Till they say my eye has caught the fire,
And my cheek the glow of the tempest ire.

"Oh no—I cannot come,
Though your southern clime is bright
I cannot leave my home
With its own glorious night;
Fair in the golden days decay,
Fairer when day-light's passed away,"

Night! oh come with me
The glorious night to know—
Shadow of Heaven is day,
Night opens Heaven below;
With its speaking stars, and its full bright moon,
And the azure robe of its burning noon.

Clime of the south is bright;
Hearts of the south are true,
Even sorrow is soft and light
As the kiss of the honey dew;
To the haunts of Love in our southern home
With a heart of Love, oh maiden come.

"Clime of the north is pure,
Hearts of the north are strong,
With firmness to endure,
Might to repel wrong;
In weal and woe, too true to roam,
I cannot leave my mountain home."

From the Albany Christian Register.

STANZAS.

The mighty conqueror of old
Who wept, because his sword had gained
Its victory o'er the brave and bold,
And left no kingdom unattained;
Who on Fame's summit proudly stood,
And won, and wore the scarlet wreath,
The laurel dyed in human blood,
The crown wove by the hand of death;

With all his power and all his might
Found in the passions of his soul
A foe who gained the final fight,
A foe, his sword could not control.

'Tis thus with man, he strives—obtains
The dazzling prize of fame or pelf,
Ambition's loftiest height he gains,—
Yet falls—a victim to himself. H.

From the Albany Christian Register.

LINES WRITTEN ON THE BLANK LEAF OF A YOUNG LADY'S BIBLE.

When the vigour of youth shall have wasted away,
And the roseate bloom of thy cheek shall decay,
When life's waning taper burns dim o'er the grave—
From the doom that awaits you, no mortal can save,
Oh! then may the precepts, those pages impart
Serve to strengthen thy hope; and to cheer up thy heart,
The blest Star of Life gild mortality's even,
And thy pathway illume, to the portals of Heaven.

BYRON.

Saw ye the clouds when arrayed in their wonder,
Riding convulsed on the tempests affray,
Saw ye the lightning flash, heard ye the thunder—
The earth and the heavens in battle array?

Saw ye the billows rise mighty and high,
The roar of the ocean, the clash of the wave;
Heard ye the hardy tar's gurgling cry,
The prayer that he breathed and the groan that he gave?

Saw ye the turban'd chief's scimitar gleaming,
As his vessel rode on o'er the boisterous flood,
While high o'er the deck the proud crescent was streaming,
His pasport to daring, his watch word to blood?

Saw ye the mountain top misty and drear,
The shrill eagle cry, and the cataract foam,
And thought not the soul of a Byron was there—
The tempest its shelter, the whirlwind its home.

But saw ye the sky, when in mild playful mood
It shone on the ripples scarce curled by the gale;
Heard ye the sailor's song hearty and rude,
Hoisting the anchor and setting the sail?

List to the tale that is tenderly telling
In a summer clime and a cypress grove,
Saw ye—ah saw ye—the mild bosom swelling,
As the beacon of hope from those that we love?

The startled tear and the downcast eye,
The soft blushing cheek and the heaving breast,
The faultering word and the liquid sigh,
And all that we wish for stands confessed.

And who but would think in moments like this
The earth decked with flowers all smiling before us,
Mid the rainbow of Hope and the sunshine of bliss,
That the happier spirit of Byron was o'er us.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1829. [NO. 22.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

BY L. S. EVERETT.

[From the Trumpet and Magazine.]

"*Be kindly affectioned one to another.*"

Romans xii. 10.

The moral world presents, to the contemplative mind, the variegated scenes of "garments rolled in blood," and virtue struggling against the powers which have conspired to overthrow it. Vice, in all its deformity, often goes unnoticed and unreproved, and assumes the boldness of religion itself; while few, very few, have the courage to assail, or the power to molest its votaries.

One of the evils which has been transmitted to us from periods of darkness, is that spirit of unkindness which pervades community, and casts a portentious gloom over the intellectual world. Go where we will, we can trace the ravages of this monstrous spirit. And, what is strange, those who pay their devotions to this demon, with the greatest zeal, are the greatest sufferers; yet by some unaccountable process, they have become enamored of the tyrant that enslaves them, and too frequently despise the overtures made for their emancipation.

It is intended, in this discourse, 1st, to point out the disadvantages which result from unkindness; 2d, to show the great advantages that would accrue to us from a compliance with the apostle's injunction as expressed in the text; and 3d, to make a few suggestions as to the best method of avoiding the evils of the former, and obtaining the benefits of the latter. And

I. The disadvantages of unkindness may be seen in every nation under heaven; in every city; in every village; in every neighbourhood; in every family—and it would be well if it stopped here—but the evil may be found in every heart. Where is the man, woman, or child, but has felt the pain it inflicts? Its ravages have been as extensive as ignorance—its devastations have been as universal as our wants. It has stalked forth "conquering and to conquer," until the world has become full of misery and guilt.

We discover the first germs of this evil in the domestick circle. Parents, though their feelings may be tender towards their children, frequently suffer themselves to be led astray by a momentary excitement, and indulge in the use of unkind language. They may be truly affectionate; but irrationally and almost inadvertently indulge passions, and utter expressions, which their own better reason condemns.

This example is soon copied by a child, and its fruits are seen in contentions about trifles.—Domesticks are tainted by the poison innocently administered; and the circle which might, under other circumstances, be like the paradise of God, becomes a babel of confusion. Unkindness begets hatred; and animosity and strife, and contention are sure to follow.—Where these begin to reign, order ceases, and happiness ends.

In neighbourhoods this spirit often prevails. A trivial affair, of little or no consequence, becomes magnified so as to constitute a source of great disquiet. One unkind word gives occasion for another, until we are compelled to exclaim—"behold! how great a matter a little fire kindleth." A false report is sometimes circulated, prejudicial to the reputation of some person careful of his good name. The injured individual, to show that he is innocent, becomes angry, and begins, in good earnest, the work of retaliation. He pursues his object with vengeance, until the peace of the neighbourhood is gone past recovery.

Whole towns are sometimes thrown into commotion in a similar way. Some evil disposed person assails the reputation of another; the one upon whom the attack is made becomes angry and retorts with severity; the friends of each espouse the cause of one or the other; and a war of words is carried on for years, perhaps, about something of very little consequence, and every source of enjoyment is dried up; while jealousy and strife embitter each department of society.

A whole State is sometimes disturbed by this spirit of unkindness. Two distinguished individuals, to whom the people look for examples, happen to espouse different sides of some important question—one accuses the other of being governed by unworthy motives—his antagonist replies in the language of severity—the people take sides—the war rages with violence, until disunion, discord, confusion and ruin stalk abroad at noon day.

The whole Union, is sometimes convulsed to its centre by unkindness. People differ—and honestly differ in opinion, relative to some

important measure of government. Impatient of opposition, one political party accuses the other of some designs against the people—crimination and recrimination follow—one abuse begets another—one act of violence begets another; until the domestick sanctuary is violated; private character is assailed; facts are distorted; falsehoods are uttered; and all the motely train of evil consequences follows. In a free government like ours this evil prevails to a great extent; but it must be eradicated, or our boasted liberty will find an early grave.

It would be well if the evil stopped here—but it does not. The christian church is divided and distracted by this root of bitterness.—The church is divided into several hundred sects; but this is not the evil of which we complain; it is well, perhaps, that there should be divisions of this kind; but the source of our apprehensiveness is the virulence and animosity, and unkindness, which prevail within the borders of Zion.

It is enough to astonish the world to reflect upon the unkindness of christians. Indeed the world has been astonished, and infidelity has laughed at our folly. "Behold them," says the unbeliever—"they profess to be the followers of the humble Jesus: Hear them vilify each other: See their angry looks: Listen to their bold denunciations; their blasphemous anathemas; their pious curses; their vindictive aspersions! See them as they buckle on their armour to fight the battles of their Lord: Behold whole nations engaged in war, all professing to be disciples of the Prince of Peace."

Well may the world despise professions of regard for religion, while the conduct of professors is so at variance with the precepts of Christ. So long as this hostility continues among the different sects, the cause of the Redeemer will suffer in the house of its pretended friends. The people must turn unto the Lord, and adopt a pure language; otherwise the day of small things will continue. We must learn our own rights, and defend them with kind words and fair means; we must duly appreciate the rights of others, and respect them as we would our own, before the world will become evangelized, or the kingdoms of the earth become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.

What an amount of happiness is destroyed by the unfriendly spirit now cherished by christians, even in this enlightened community. How reckless are mankind of the consequences of their unkind and uncharitable expressions. One professor is represented as a heretic—another as an infidel—a third as a hypocrite—a fourth as a bigot—a fifth as an enemy of all righteousness. One sect is represented as enemies of the truth; as children of the evil one—another as a band of deceivers; a third as a combination of conspirators, and so on.

Now all this is entirely useless—nay worse—pernicious. And this is the fruit of unkindness. It is folly to prate about having been converted, and about having the love of God shed abroad in the heart, so long as this bitterness of feeling predominates. Professions are nothing, where affection is not. The christian professor ought to be like our divine Master, a universal friend, the moment he takes upon himself the name of Christ. If, therefore, he finds it in his heart to treat any person unkindly, his conduct proves that his professions are nothing.

We sometimes find this evil spirit within the very walls of societies. Strange as it may appear, individuals who believe the same doctrine, who partake at the same table, and worship in the same house; who have one common interest at stake; even such will sometimes indulge this unkind and unprofitable spirit. This is an evil, which above all things should be avoided. For if once permitted to enter the sanctuary of social communion, it is worse than the pestilence that walketh in darkness. It will poison the fountain from whence our purest joys are derived—it will embitter the last drop of comfort—it will corrode the best affections; prevent the purest aspirations; and blight the holiest emotions of the soul.

These, brethren, are facts which relate to the existence of the evil I am labouring to expose; and I have digressed, somewhat, from the course I had marked out, with a view of impressing these facts upon your minds. We behold the fruits of unkindness every where; and I think too highly of the good sense of my hearers not to believe that they have discovered the evil. But there is danger of becoming too indifferent to things of this sort; it would be better for all of us to think more seriously of those errors which custom sanctions and fashion approves.

When we turn from a contemplation of abstract truth, to examine the effects produced by the prevalence of errour, it is then that the mind forms an estimate of the value of the one, and the disadvantages of the other. And amidst all the useless trumpery of the schools, the idea that severity and unkindness will produce love, obedience, and righteousness, stands pre-eminent in absurdity. I would challenge the world to produce an instance in which unkind treatment ever did any good.

This theory of ignorance has promised much, and performed nothing. It has promised to subjugate empires of darkness—to convert nations of heathen—to renovate the moral world, and introduce a day of millennial peace and glory. It has gone on in its mad career to deluge the world in blood, and extract bitterness from every moral sweet,—but satan's kingdom has enlarged its borders; the nations sit in darkness; the world remains unregenerated; and wars, and rumours of wars, and all the

wild phantasms of sin yet disturb mankind.—For more than five thousand years this system of unkindness and force has prevailed; and yet its advocates will find it a difficult matter to prove its efficacy in a single instance.

On the other hand, though a painful, it is not a difficult task, to prove most conclusively that unkindness has resulted greatly to the disadvantage of mankind. This will appear from a careful attention to the instances which have fallen under our observation.

Children have suffered much from the severity of parents and guardians. Most persons can call to mind instances in which many hours of unhappiness have succeeded unkind treatment received in early life. True, we may have done wrong, but how much more efficacious would have been the language of love. That would have produced a true and profitable sorrow for the offence; but, ten to one, severity added to guilt and remorse of conscience, the desire to retaliate, and the spirit of revenge.

But the evil did not end here. The force of example may have led us to treat others unkindly, and thus perpetuated the misery.—There must be some new discovery of a principle of human nature different from any thing we have yet observed, before I can be persuaded that bad examples are harmless. And especially the examples of parents have a powerful influence upon the tender mind.

Who can express the amount of misery which has resulted from difficulties in neighbourhoods, communities, and nations; And who will deny that this vast amount of suffering is the offspring of unkindness? It is impossible to trace it to any other cause.

But there is another point of light in which our subject may be seen to advantage. I allude to the crimes which have been caused by unkindness. It may seem strange to many, that we should charge upon this severity, the very iniquities which it has pretended to prevent; or that we should undertake to prove, that it causes the very sins which it punishes; but such, I verily believe is the fact.

Within the walls of our prisons are hundreds of vicious and miserable beings. I do not intend to palliate the guilt of those unhappy sufferers; but would seek carefully for the cause of their guilt. I know that to be in fashion, I must talk about the astonishing depravity of the human heart—about the fall of Adam and Eve—about the degeneracy of the times—about the awful ravages of intemperance, &c. &c. But I leave those fruitful topicks to be discussed by others, they have been preached too long already. My object is to look carefully after the cause of that very depravity which is so loudly complained of, and if possible remove it.

Unkindness is the cause of many of those sins of which the world so loudly complains, and which the philanthropist so truly deplores.

That all men are liable to do wrong must be confessed, and this all-prevailing liability should teach us to forgive one another. But mankind too often attempt to establish a reputation by utteriug their abhorrence of sin, and by complaining of the depravity of their fellow-beings. Hence it is, that persons of questionable virtue are the most vociferous in their denunciations of vice. Like the felon who cries "stop thief" to mislead his pursuers and elude their vigilance.

This propensity has engendered a degree of censoriousness entirely incompatible with moral improvement. Faults are often magnified into crimes, and "trifles light as air" by the magick of a zeal for God not according to knowledge, become "confirmed strong as holy writ" of innate and incurable depravity.—Early indiscretions are conceived of as indications of some direful catastrophe; and a trespass upon a store of sweet-meats, is the forerunner of some awful crime which will end the life of the trespasser upon the gallows.

Lessons of this sort, frequently repeated, render the mind familiar with terrors designed to reclaim it, and the heart callous to the reproofs intended for its good; until at last the conscience becomes seared as with a hot iron, and its compunctions if not destroyed entirely are feeble and ineffectual. Persons who are so unfortunate as to have been thus impressed in early life, learn to sport with crime, regardless of its consequences, and too often become the victims of the errours they have imbibed.

When desperation siezes upon the mind, and the miserable trangressor is brought to the bar and condemned, the next resort is to confinement and hard labour—all with a view as is pretended, to reform the sinner. How far this plan has succeeded the world may know by taking pains to examine the cases in which reformation has been effected by that process.—It may be necessary to resort to such measures to restrain the vicious, and it may not be necessary. At all events, those measures will seldom, if ever, reform the heart.

But, the hearer may exclaim—"What, shall we demolish our prisons and let loose upon the world a horde of desperadoes—shall we abolish our courts of justice and let the world run mad with folly—shall we abandon the terrors of the gallows and expose our lives to the midnight assassin?" No—Let rational beings be incarcerated till the world is enlightend—let every measure for the safety of the people be continued until mankind become wise; but let all such measures for the safety of our lives and property be purely and exclusively defensive. And while men, through ignorance, remain vicious, and while they remain in durance, let those who are at liberty to see the light of heaven, be active and persevering in their efforts to meliorate the condition of their fellow-beings.

Do you ask how an improvement so great is to be effected? Our answer is, by kindness and affection. Let the oppression of wealth cease; let the dishonest man forego his knaveries; let the proud abandon their insolence; let the haughty humble themselves; let the bigot abandon his cant; let the pharisee dispense with his boasting; and let the moralist be generous in the extension of charity—let this be done, and the world will do well enough.

But it may be replied—"these improvements are set forth as the means of preventing crime, whereas they are the end itself." No—the plan suggested is intended for the benefit of those who generally escape censure—for those who complain most vehemently against the depravity of the world and the sins of mankind. Let such pluck the beam out of their own eye and then they will see more clearly to extract the mote from their neighbour's eye.

Another view of our subject will show us the bad tendency of certain religious principles. Christianity purports to address itself to the heart, and to operate upon the affections. It is designed to apply the healing influences of the spirit to the inner man—to probe the heart to its core—to pour in upon the soul the balsam of life, light, and love, thereby cleansing it of its imperfections and impurities. Its language is—"be kindly affectioned one to another."

But ignorance has inverted a different plan, and adopted a different language.—She has ransacked creation, and taxed imagination to find terrours, and threatenings, and denunciations, with which to frighten the wicked, and evangelize the simple. Her votaries have,

"Here fixed the dreadful, there the blest abodes;
Fear made her devils, and weak hope her gods;
Gods partial, changeful, passionate, unjust,
Whose attributes were rage, revenge, or lust—
Such as the souls of cowards might conceive,
And, formed like tyrants, tyrants would believe."

It is painfully interesting to contemplate the industry with which religious people have applied such means to the hearts of men, to frighten—and charity inclines us to say—to reform them. Men have been called fools, madmen, and heirs of the evil one; the follies of the world have been denounced and condemned, as the result of entire moral alienation—the sins of mankind have been magnified into unpardonable offences—and an unwillingness to accredit all this, has been regarded as an act of rebellion against the Almighty.

That much misery has been occasioned by the promulgation of such terrours, is evinced by the experience of thousands; and that such measures, though adopted with the purest intentions, and with the best of motives, have resulted to the disadvantage of morality, we cannot doubt. For, aside from the tangible proofs of this fact, which are furnished to our hands in the degraded condition of thousands who believe those errours, we have enough to convince us, in a well known law of our nature.

Such is the constitution of the human mind, that it cannot love an object that is not lovely—it cannot feel grateful unless some favour has been bestowed—it cannot be induced to follow righteousness, unless the path of wisdom is adorned with the flowers of peace.

By a similar train of reasoning, we come to the conclusion that terrour may extort a confession of sin—that fear may produce an appearance of reform—that hatred may incline the sinner to make pretensions to love; but none of these things can produce the reality. On the contrary, when the throne of God is supposed to tremble with wrath, the sinner flees from it—when Sinia thunders, the soul is dismayed—when Satan stalks forth a victorious monarch, and boasts of having subjugated nine-tenths of the empire of Jehovah, he will be sure to gain recruits.

Degrade mankind in their own estimation, and they will disregard religion and morality. If you would reform the heart, it must be encouraged. But mankind are sometimes so carried away with a love of theory, that, to prove the depravity of others, they will expatiate upon their own. Hence it is, that people are fond of acknowledging, that, were it not for the fear of ruin, they would be much more wicked than they are. It would be unkind in us to believe them to be as bad as they represent themselves; and we would gladly spare them the trouble of convincing us at their own cost.

These observations are made to show the entire insufficiency of terrour, and the language of severity, to reclaim the wicked.—Whoever will take pains to examine this subject, will find that much of that good which has been supposed to arise from such preaching, either exists only in the imaginations of mankind, or is to be imputed to some other cause. Far be it from me to deny, that much good has resulted from the preaching of those whose sentiments we cannot believe, and equally far the thought, that christians of other denominations are not as good as ourselves but what we contend for, is, that the good feelings, the good conduct, and the holy comforts, which they experience, and practise, are not the fruits of fear but of love—of the kindness and mercy of God, as manifested to their hearts.

Whoever has attended to these matters has found, that the soul of man is never subdued—his voice is never attuned to the praise of God, until the love of God is poured out upon him. Terrour, like the wind in the fable, may blow ever so hard, without inclining the sinner to throw aside his iniquities or take off his garments of self-righteousness; but when the beams of the sun of righteousness break out, and the dews of divine grace distil upon him, he joyously and cheerfully throws them off.—

Hence it is, that love alone is efficacious. And from what has been said, we may safely conclude, that many disadvantages have occurred to mankind from the practice of severity, and the language of unkindness.

II. We are next to consider the advantages to be derived from kindness and affection. And these advantages are too obvious to require much labour in pointing them out.

We may discover the good effects of these virtues in our own fireside circles. We may behold the fruits of obedience to the apostolick injunction, in the smiling faces of our children. I venture to affirm that a kind word, a kind look, a kind action, was never lost in the world. Happiness ever follows this god-like tenderness, with all its attendant blessings; and joys and comforts unspeakable flow from its exercise. It excites love and confidence in the breasts of our little ones, and diffuses that holy peace which the world can neither give nor take away. Its rewards, too, are ample. Those who are "kindly affectioned," are blessed with beholding prattling innocence around them, expanding the powers of the mind, and strengthening the ties of love. Every effusion of this divine principle strengthens the claims of parental authority, and renders obedience certain.

In neighbourhoods, the good effects of kindness are apparent. It never trifles with the character of any one; but strives to disseminate peace and good will. It forgives an injury, not seven times only, but seventy times seven. Bickerings, and jealousy, and strife, cannot exist within the sphere of its influence. It is like the wisdom from above—"pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy."

In towns, States, and empires, its influence is no less salutary. And when it enters into the laws of the land, or is diffused throughout the institutions of a country, crime diminishes, and the "kingdoms of the world become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ."

When this messenger from Heaven visits churches and societies, and predominates in the hearts of their members, peace dwells within the borders of Zion, and the trumpet of salvation sounds joyously upon her walls. Then it is, that souls flow together like drops of water, and obduracy melts into contrition. The walls of Jerusalem become strength and her gates praise. The tribute of gratitude ascends like morning incense to the skies; the song of praise thrills through the soul, and the hearts of men become the tabernacle of God.

When this divine spirit predominates, and presides over the destinies of a religious community, discord ceases and contention is no more. Brethren then "dwell together in unity," and are bound together by the bonds of peace. Then the day-spring from on high dispels every cloud of darkness, and the glowing light of truth, and the holy fervour of love divine burst in upon a world lying in wickedness, and reveal the joys of Heaven.

But what a glorious scene should we behold, if the language of kindness could be adopted by all the different sects and denominations of professing christians. What a splendid revolution would be brought about in the religious world, if one sect should be kindly affectioned to another. Should such an event transpire, the millennium would come upon us by surprise. Should all professing christians adopt this language, and cultivate this spirit, such a union would be formed, that vice, infidelity, and unbelief, would flee from the world in dismay.

But why do we attempt a description of the blessings that would result from the universal prevalence of this virtue? Eye hath not seen—ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive of the amount of happiness that would result from such a state of things. Leaving it, therefore, to your imaginations, to fill up the sketch I have attempted to draw, we pass,

III. To submit a few reflections relative to the best method of avoiding the evils, at which I have hinted.

1. The inculcation of correct principles will assist us in the attainment of the object we have represented as being so essential. Without moral principles—without being doctrinated, the mind will never arrive at perfection. It is folly to imagine that man—a creature of education, can obtain the requisite knowledge of truth by an impulse of the spirit of God, or by a sudden and irresistible communication from heaven. The day of miracles has passed, and we must content ourselves by searching for knowledge as for hidden treasures.

Nor can the rudiments of morality, or the elementary principles of christianity, be learned from creeds and commandments of men. For errours have crept into the systems of mankind, and poisoned even the wisdom of this world, until it is no longer expedient or safe to adopt them. And can the most honest opinions of good men, have been warped by the influence of an erroneous education? This is true of the ideas generally entertained of the subject which we have attempted to discuss on this occasion. Mankind seem to have borrowed their ideas of justice from the model of the government under which they have chanced to live; and perhaps the model thus innocently adopted, has been defective in its more important principles. It will not do, to judge what ought to be, by what has been, or is generally assented to. For errours in theory, or in practice, can never be rendered useful by age, or beneficial by the approbation of misguided millions.

The doctrines of past times, and theories of

long standing, are proved defective by their inadequacy to effect the purpose for which they were instituted. They may have done well in the infancy of the world; but the time has come when we 'must put away childish things.' If force and fear have failed to do the good intended, after a trial of five thousand years, we are called upon, by the imperative voice of suffering humanity, to lay them aside. Other doctrines must be sought after and found, and when found, adopted. Worse we cannot have, than those to which the world has long paid its deference—better we may find, if we suffer ourselves to be guided by reason and scripture.

I know mankind are tenacious of their opinions; but as the work of improvement goes on, "old things must pass away."—The tide rolls on—and if we would not be like the philosopher in the tub, we must roll with it—or the tide in the affairs of men will surely overflow us. New discoveries are making way for still greater improvements; and if we will but do our duty, the next generation will be wiser and better than their fathers.

The doctrines to be introduced and inculcated, must partake largely of the love of God—they must be tempered with divine mercy, and reared upon the imperishable foundation of eternal grace. Nothing short of this will do away the evils of which we complain. Old systems of terrour have not—they never will, introduce into our world the language of kindness and affection. We cannot gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles—neither can we gather the fruits of peace from bad seed sown in bad places. Let the doctrine of impartial [illegible] not believed, only, but practised, & [illegible] witness the sublime spectacle of [illegible] kind travelling cheerfully and [illegible] pleasant paths of peace. [illegible] to obtain the blessings [illegible] inculcating good princi- [illegible] good examples. I [illegible] in recommend- [illegible] upon you an [illegible] be a de- [illegible] lessons [illegible] with

2. Our endeavours before mentioned by in[illegible] ples, must be attended with[illegible] feel assured, my brethren, tha[illegible] ing the course I do not impose[illegible] irksome or unpleasant task. It wi[illegible] lightful employment to accompany ou[illegible] of affection with examples of kindness.

Shall we not, then, in our intercourse w[illegible] mankind, strive to set the world an exampl[illegible] worthy of imitation; Our doctrine is the doctrine of God—the doctrine of love; to be consistent, therefore, we must conform our conduct to that divine principle. This world, wise as it affects to be, must be taught its duty, and pointed to the most worthy object it can obtain, by Universalism. Yes—much as it is despised, Universalism must introduce the acceptable year of the Lord, and break the mental fetters of mankind. It will, as it progresses, open the prison doors, and set at liberty them that are bruised—it will, when understood and practiced, drive cruelty from the abodes of man, and frighten errour from her murky hiding place. But this must be brought about by good examples.

Brethren—"Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another; not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer; distributing to the necessity of the poor; given to hospitality; bless them which persecute you; bless, and curse not; rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep; be of the same mind one towards another; mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate; be not wise in your own conceits; recompense to no man evil for evil; provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved—avenge not yourselves; but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, "vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt keep coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

Carry these principles with you, as you mingle in the society of the world—let your conduct be governed by the exhortation of the apostle—let the christian virtue, now recommended, be cherished in your hearts, and the world may affect to despise, but it cannot hate you.

Let us also be careful not to let any root of bitterness spring up amongst us as a denomination. We cannot be too careful in this respect. O, never let it be said of us, that we have dishonoured our profession and injured the cause of Christ, by discord among ourselves.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR, NO. 2.

CHARLESTOWN, Oct. 6, 1829.

Br. Doubleday,—My last was written you from Hartford. I now address you from Charlestown, Mass. at which place I arrived after a fatiguing days ride on last Wednesday evening. I can say little of the place. He who has lived in the delightful villages of the West will not find much that is peculiarly fascinating in the older villages of the East.

Some pleasing recollections and peculiarly dear to the American bosom are awakened on visiting this place. The battle of Bunker's Hill famous in our revolutionary history was fought here, and fought too with all that desperate valour and determined heroism, which characterize man when contending for a just cause against an overwhelming opposition. I cannot speak of battles. I hate war and have often wondered why man so fruitful in inventions should not long ere this have found out some means to prevent this desolating scourge. Yet I should deem my-

self traitor to my country could I view unmoved the spot where our undisciplined Militia contended so bravely for that liberty which we now so justly boast.

The monument to be erected on the scene of this memorable battle, is now delayed I believe for the want of funds, though it is thought the delay will not be long. The monument is now raised to the height of forty feet, and when completed it will be, I am informed two hundred and twenty. It will be a grand thing when finished.

Charlestown I have said is a very pleasant place, and I see no reason why it should be otherwise. The inhabitants may justly boast of their refinement, and this is no wonder, only Charles River separates them from Boston, the metropolis of New England, the focus of "steady habits" and Emporium of literature, wealth, &c. There is one thing, though not peculiar to this section, seems to be carried to a greater extent here than in any other place I have visited with exception of Boston, which by the by is no exception at all. I refer to the old barbarous practice of *flogging* children at school. How long will it be ere men will learn wisdom, and be satisfied that a blow from a hickory stick or a rattan is not the most successful method of getting learning into a child's head!

From my own experience, I am convinced a man who is fit to teach a school will never have occasion to strike a child, and parents who think or who possess any regard for their children ought by every means in their power to discountenance this savage practice. I am not a little surprized to find the practice tolerated here where the people are far in advance of many other parts of our country. But old habits hang round us and I know not as we shall ever have courage enough to shake them off.

There is a fine society of Universalists in this place. One day's residence among them is sufficient to refute the slanderous assertions that Universalism is a licentious doctrine. The society enjoy the pastoral labours of our friend and brother L. S. Everett. His labours are well received and duly appreciated; and I can but think if Br. E. never obtains any better heaven than he now enjoys with this large society of personal friends, he will not have much reason to complain. I know of nothing on earth that could add to the agreeableness of his situation. I do not envy him, for he deserves it. I preached to his congregation last Sabbath afternoon. I knew little of church musick before. I wish this delightful branch of Divine Worship was more carefully cultivated at the West. But we have been engaged in removing the forest and making the wilderness smile.

In Boston I became acquainted with Rev. Hosea Ballou, whose praise is in all our churches, and not undeservedly so. He has a good society, and very large congregation. I preached to his congregation last Sabbath morning and evening—in the evening to the largest collection of people to which I have ever spoken.

Liberal sentiment spreads rapidly in this section.—Orthodoxy has seen her best days here. She has fallen and will, through God, soon breathe her last. No matter she has lived long enough and tormented us long enough to allow us some relief.

My visit has been so far attended with high satisfaction to myself. The Universalists here in their outward appearance have very little to distinguish them from the other denominations. They observe the Lord's Supper, an institution which I have generally considered of no great practical benefit. It is doubtless attended, as I have before remarked, with some advantages. Mankind must have some outward ordinance.

Universalism is becoming respectable in this quarter, and I trust the reign of a burning hell is nearly ended. But I have already trespassed too long upon your patience. I am dear brother, Yours, &c.

O. A. Brownson.

SELECTIONS.

[From the Trumpet and Magazine.]

GENERAL CONVENTION.

PROCEEDINGS, &c.

The General Convention of Universalists of the New-England States and others, met, according to adjournment, in Winchester, N. H. on Tuesday evening, Sept. 15th, 1829, and opened the business of the session by uniting with Br. Warren Skinner in devout thanksgiving and prayer to Almighty God. Organized the Council by choosing

Br. Sebastian Streeter, *Moderator*,
Br. Sylvanus Cobb, *Clerk*—and
Br. T. G. Farnsworth, *Assist. Clerk.*

Appointed Brs. H. Ballou, T. F. King, and W. Skinner a Committee to receive applications for Letters of Fellowship, and for Ordination, during the present session, and report on the same.

Adjourned to 8 o'clock, Wednesday morning, and commended ourselves to God in prayer by Br. T. Whittemore.

Wednesday morning.—Met according to adjournment, and joined in prayer with Br. W. Morse.

Received through the Standing Clerk, a communication from Br. J. S. Green, of Providence, resigning his membership in this body.

Ordered, That when any brother belonging to this body chooses to withdraw his fellowship, and makes his withdrawal known to the Standing Clerk, it shall be the duty of said Clerk to make due record thereof, publish it in some periodical paper, and communicate the same to the next session of the Convention.

Voted, To receive into the fellowship of this Convention, "The Green Mountain Association of Universalists," including the counties of Windsor and Rutland.

Accepted the Report of the Committee on Fellowship, &c. in favour of the Ordination of Br. Thomas J. Sawyer.

As Br. P. Dean proposed inviting the Rev. D. Pickering of Providence, (R. I.) to take part in the publick exercises of the occasion, it was

Voted, That, considering his recent withdrawal of fellowship from this body, together with the circumstances under which the withdrawal took place, and the manner of his accounting for it to the publick, the Rev. Mr. Pickering be not invited to take any part with us in the services of this session of the Convention.

Adjourned to 8 o'clock, Thursday morning.

Thursday morning—Met according to adjournment, and joined with Br. H. Ballou 2d in address to the Throne of Grace.

Voted, To receive into the fellowship of this Convention, "The Boston Association of Universalists, comprising the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Middlesex and Essex.

Voted, That the several Committees chosen at the last session of this Convention, be continued in their appointment.

Appointed Brs. H. Ballou 2d, L. S. Everett, and S. Cobb, a Committee to transcribe from the Standing Records, the Constitution, and all the By-Laws or Rules now in force for the government of this body, into a form suitable for publication, and lay it before the Convention at its next session.

Voted, That we approve of the purpose of the First Universalist Society in Woburn, Mass. to commence a Literary Institution in that place; and that we recommend it to the patronage of the publick, and of Universalists in particular.

Accepted the Report of the Committee in favour of granting Letters of Fellowship to Brs. Alfred V. Bassett and Samuel P. Skinner.

Voted, That whereas Brs. Sebastian and Russell Streeter have published a new Hymn Book, designed for the use of Universalist Societies, that this Convention recommend said Book to the notice of Universalist Societies.

Br. E. Case, of Lowell, introduced a Resolve designed to discountenance the improper use of ardent spirits.

All viewed alike the importance of the object aimed at by the mover of the Resolve, but there was a difference of opinion respecting the propriety of this Convention's passing such a Resolve, and its tendency to promote the desired object. And as there was not sufficient time to mature the subject according to its importance,

Voted, To postpone the further consideration of this Resolve to the next session of the Convention.

Voted, That the Clerk prepare a Circular, and publish it, together with the Minutes of this session, in the "Trumpet and Universalist Magazine."

Adjourned to meet, by divine permission, in Lebanon, (N. H.) on the third Wednesday and Thursday in September, 1830.

Commended ourselves to God in prayer by Br. S. Streeter.

S. STREETER, *Moderator.*

SYLVANUS COBB, *Clerk.*

T. G. FARNSWORTH, *Assist. Clerk.*

ORDER OF PUBLICK SERVICES.

WEDNESDAY MORNING.

Introductory Prayer by Br. T. F. King. Sermon by Br. Adin Ballou, from 1 Sam. xvi. 7, "*For the Lord seeth not as man seeth.*" Prayer by Br. O. A. Skinner.

AFTERNOON.

Prayer by Br. Wm. Morse. Sermon by Br. S. Streeter, from Psalm lxxvi. 10, "*The wrath of man shall praise thee; and the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain.*" Prayer by Br. T. J. Whitcomb.

EVENING.

At the meeting-house.—Prayer by Br. L. Willis. Sermon by Br. P. Dean, from Acts xxvi. 28, "*Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.*" Prayer by Br. N. Wright, jr.

At the West Village.—Prayer by Br. M. B. Ballou. Sermon by Br. S. Cobb, from Acts x. 42, "*And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.*" Prayer by Br. J. Ward.

THURSDAY MORNING.

Introductory Prayer by Br. S. C. Loveland. Sermon by Br. M. Rayner, from 1. Tim. ii. 1, "*I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men.*" Prayer by Br. J. Moore.

AFTERNOON.

Ordination of Br. Thomas J. Sawyer.

Introductory Prayer by Br. E. Case. Sermon by H. Ballou, from Eph. iii. 8, "*Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.*" Ordaining Prayer by Br. Joshua Flagg. Charge, by Br. R. Streeter. Right Hand of Fellowship by Br. Hosea Ballou 2d. Concluding Prayer by Br. C. Gardner.

EVENING.

Prayer by Br. W. Skinner. Sermon by Br. E. Case, from Titus ii. 11, 12, "*For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.*" Concluding Prayer by Br. T. G. Farnsworth.

MINISTERING BRETHREN PRESENT.

Hosea Ballou, Sebastian Streeter, Paul Dean, and T. J. Whitcomb, Boston; Hosea Ballou 2d. Roxbury; Thomas Whittemore, Cambridgeport; Sylvanus Cobb, Malden; Russell Streeter, Watertown; Adin Ballou, Milford; T. G. Farnsworth, Haverhill; William Morse, Nantucket; Calvin Gardner, Duxbury; Eliphalet Case, jr. Lowell; Otis A. Skinner, Woburn; Lyman Maynard, Oxford; Massena B. Ballou, Charlton; Nathaniel Wright, jr. Attleborough; Lemuel Willis, Salem; David Ballou, Monroe; Menzies Rayner, Hartford, Ct.; Joshua Flagg, Hudson, N. Y.; Samuel C. Loveland, Reading, Vt.; Warren Skinner, Cavendish, Vt.; Joseph Ward, Barnard, Vt.; Wm. Bell, Wood-

stock, Vt. ; Robert Bartlett, Hartland, Vt. ; Isaiah Boynton, Townsend, Vt. ; Ezekiel Vose, St. Johnsbury, Vt. ; Thomas F. King, Portsmouth, N. H. ; David Cooper, Washington, N. H. ; John Moore and S. P. Skinner, Lebanon, N. H. ; I. D. Williamson, Jaffrey, N. H. ; Wm. S. Balch and T. J. Sawyer, Winchester, N. H.

—

GENERAL EPISTLE.

To the Universalist Churches and Societies, and to believers who are scattered abroad, the Ministers and Delegates composing the General Convention of Universalists of the New-England States and others, send Christian Salutation. Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.

BRETHREN—Through the goodness of God, we have been permitted, to meet once more in Annual Convention, for promoting mutual acquaintance and brotherly love, for strengthening each other's hands and confirming each other's hearts, and for advancing the holy cause of our impartial and efficient Saviour. Our kind reception by the Society in Winchester, the presence of an unusally large number of Ministering Brethren, the general harmony which prevailed in our counsels and deliberations, the information received from various parts of our country, and the devout prayers, the lucid Gospel instruction, and the masterly and melting musick, of the tabernacle of publick worship, conspired to render the occasion a profitable and happy one, and caused our hearts to exclaim, "It is good for us to be here." Two young men of good promise received Letters of Fellowship as preachers of the Gospel ; and one, who had proved himself worthy of this high vocation, and deserving of our confidence and esteem, was set apart to the work of the ministry by solemn Ordination.

By Letters from Societies, and oral communications, we received very encouraging information of the advancement of the light of the Gospel, and the present condition and prospects of the numerous Societies engaged in our common cause. The Society in Haverhill, Mass. received an accession of more than fifty new members, during the last winter and spring. The Society in Salem, Mass. which has in times past gone through alternate seasons of prosperity and adversity, has increased in numbers during the last eighteen months, in a quadruple proportion. The Letter from Cavendish, Vt. gave us very pleasing information of the growth and prosperity of the Society in that place, and the increased and increasing attention of the people to the things which belong to their moral health and peace. And the Societies generally from which we received information, appear to be growing in numbers, and especially in the observance of good order, and in the zeal and love of the Gospel.

By Letters which have been sent out, during the past year, from the several Associations which are under the jurisdiction of this Convention, and from other Conventions and Associations engaged in the advancement of the same good cause, we learn that they are coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and sitting down in the kingdom of God, in the light of the promises delivered to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The influence of the light of these Gospel promises, has banished from our country a great quantity of hatred, and wrath, and misery, and succeeded it with life, and love, and joy. It frees men from the disagreeable and injurious labour, of striving to harden their feelings into such hatred of their neighbours, as to be prepared for an unmoved and indifferent view of their infinite torments ;—and it teaches them to love their neighbours as themselves, and to rejoice in the blessed hope that death shall ultimately be swallowed up in victory, and tears wiped away from off all faces.

Brethren, when we consider the amount, and the *kind* of opposition, which we have had to encounter, from the prejudices, the pride, the narrow and mistaken interests, and the vain fashions of the world,—and yet see how abundantly our humble endeavours for the advancement of the cause we profess have been succeeded, we have great reason to bless and praise the Lord, to lean upon him with increased confidence, and to be even more diligent and faithful in his holy service. Surely, we may say, "The Lord of Hosts is with us ; the God of Jacob is our refuge."

But much remains yet to be done, in pulling down the dominion of darkness, sin and death, and building up the reign of righteousness and peace. And every believer in the Gospel, however humble his sphere of action, may do something as a co-worker with Jesus in this blessed labour. By an upright walk, a meek and firm defence of moral and religious truth in private conversation, a reasonable assistance in the support of the publick ministry of the word, and by a punctual attendance on publick worship, to enliven in his own heart the flame of devotion, and to help enkindle the devotions of others,—by these means, we say the humblest christian may do something, yea, *much*, not only to promote his own happiness, but likewise to promote the happiness of others. He may render himself a light and a blessing to the world.

Brethren in the ministry, may we all be *faithful*. May the precious faith, the rich hopes and consolations, and the excellent graces of the Gospel, which we inculcate upon others, predominate in our own hearts. Let all narrow love of self, and all carnal ambition for pre-eminence, be swallowed up and lost, in a supreme love and devout engagedness for the interests of the Redeemer's cause. In this way, and in this way only, shall we find the plea-

sure of the Lord, the reign of truth and human happiness, to prosper in our hands. By this supreme love, and devout and faithful engagedness, for the interests of the Gospel of the Universal Saviour, we shall not scatter and destroy, but gather and feed, the flock of Christ; and shall be the means of bringing in thousands of "other sheep—who are not (now) of this fold." "Let us then lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us; looking unto Jesus, the authour and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him (viz. the good of mankind,) endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." Per order,

SYLVANUS COBB.

[From the Religious Inquirer]

"SPIRITUAL CONDITION OF INFANTS."

In our paper of week before last we made some strictures upon an article in the Episcopal Watchman, under the title, "The Church not a voluntary Society." In which we attempted to show the incorrectness of the article, both in regard to its leading principle, and the inferences supposed to result from it. In the Watchman of last week is an editorial paragraph in reply to those strictures; in which however, no attempt is made to defend the general position, that the Church is not a voluntary Society; but it purports to be an answer to the question whether "all Infants, until they are baptized, lie under God's displeasure? and that, as soon as they shall have been baptized, God will love them, and receive them to his favour, and not before?"

The Editor, with much candour and sincerity, we doubt not, proceeds to advance his sentiments on the subject of the "Spiritual condition of Infants": "not doubting, (he remarks) that every attentive and candid reader will find them perfectly consistent with the Holy Scriptures, with ecclesiastical antiquity, and with reason." Here indeed *we* doubt, we more than doubt. And must solicit the attention of the Editor of the Watchman to our reasons for dissenting from the views which he so confidently advances.

"All children, without exception," he remarks, "are born with an imperfect, unholy nature, transmitted to them as the necessary inheritance from sinful parents." Now this may be the sentiment of the Editor, but notwithstanding he has quoted the 9th Article of the Creed of his church in proof, we should be glad to know what *Scriptural* evidence he can adduce to establish his assertion. That the nature of all children is imperfect we do not deny. That is, that the nature of all is limited in its powers or capabilities. But we know not that any guilt can attach to this imperfection. If it be so, the angels in heaven must be guilty, for imperfect all creatures, less than the Infinite God are, and ever must be. The Editor of the Watchman surely will not contend that we fall under the "displeasure of God" because we are not more exalted beings, or because our moral, intellectual and physical powers or susceptibilities are not more unlimited.

That all children, or that any child is born with an "unholy nature," is, we are confident, equally repugnant to Scripture and enlightened reason, however consonant it may be to "Ecclesiastical antiquity." What are we to understand by the term nature when applied to a child? We can understand nothing more than the peculiar constitution of mind or body, possessed, together with all the powers and susceptibilities which make up what we term the child. Now the child, or infant, had no hand in making one of these properties, either of mind or body. These constitute his existence. He could no more make one of them than he could the whole, and he could not make the whole unless he could act before he was. Certainly then there can be no unholiness attached to the infant, for which the infant is to blame, or which has been occasioned by the slightest fault of the child.

The nature of every child we had supposed was such as God had given that child, and neither blame nor unholiness could attach to it, until it, by personal actions transgressed the laws of God. If the nature of the child is wrong, we must blame him who made it, and not the child who bears it; consequently we cannot perceive how it can be said children are born with an "unholy nature."

But the Watchman says, this is "transmitted as a necessary inheritance from sinful parents." Where is the Scripture which teaches that the guilt or unholiness of the parents are transmitted to the children? We have read somewhere, that "ye shall no longer use this Proverb in Israel, the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." And we assert, without fear of refutation, that the Gospel no where teaches that the sins of the parents do in the least conceivable sense, affect the moral character of infants, otherwise than by example, when the child is old enough to observe and follow it.

We deem this subject important. It is, in our estimation, one of the principal errours of the church, that children are born unholy. If the principle laid down in the Watchman be true, every child born of pious parents, would be born with a pious nature, a thing very contrary to fact, if the common observation that Clergyman's children are the worst of any be true. Sin, according to Scripture, is the transgression of the law. It cannot exist before the act of transgression. It must also be the transgression of a *known* law, of one that is understood; for it would be repugnant to

every principle of moral justice to blame one for transgressing a law of whose existence and nature he is entirely ignorant. Now no one can pretend the new born infant has this knowledge, consequently cannot be a sinner. Sin is also of a personal nature. One man is not a sinner because another man has transgressed the law. We can hardly pronounce the child a thief because his father has stolen. Hence we see no propriety in saying the child is born unholy because its parents were sinful.

Unholiness must be the state of sinfulness or the condition into which the person is thrown by the act of transgression. It has application to character but can have none to nature. We are unable to understand what is meant by our unholy nature. Does the Editor of the Watchman mean any thing more by this expression than that the child is born with a susceptibility of receiving wrong impressions, and consequently of having a sinful or unholy practice? If he does, will he tell us plainly what that something more is? If this is all, children are born no more unholy than Adam was made.—He had a susceptibility or a capability of sinning, or else he could never have sinned.—That he did sin, we presume will not be denied.

The Watchman has quoted the 9th Article of the church to establish his position relative to infants. The language is strong and deserves notice. "In every person born into this world —the fault and corruption of" his "nature, [called original or birth-sin,] deserveth God's wrath and damnation"!

By "wrath and damnation" here, the Watchman means, not the mere pains and sorrows of this life, but the penalty of endless misery in the world to come. By nature, or "birth-sin," that is, we suppose, the sin of being born, all children are under the displeasure of God and deserve damnation.

The Editor of the Watchman has told us that he doubts not every candid man will admit his views are agreeable to reason. Does he think the position a reasonable one that infants are under the *displeasure* of God? Does he really believe the infant, ere it has done good or evil, or been capable of a single moral action, deserves endless damnation, for the fault and corruption of his nature; a fault and corruption with which the infant can in no sense be chargeable? If he does, and if he believes it consistent with reason, we are at a loss to know what he would call reason.

Christ blessed little children—declared that of such is the kingdom of heaven, and he told his disciples that except they became converted and as little children, they could not enter into the kingdom of heaven. It is somewhat singular that Christ should require his disciples to be as little children, if children are deserving "God's wrath and damnation." Christ also took a little child and said, "suffer little children to come unto me,—for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Strange language, we think, if little children are unholy by nature, and deserve damnation merely for the crime of being born human beings.

The Watchman has not done what we had a right to expect. He spoke of his views agreeing with Scripture, but he has not quoted a single passage, nor attempted to show any agreement between them and his statement.—We are willing to take his assertion for proof that he states his honest convictions, but we must have some other testimony to satisfy our mind that those convictions are either true or rational. Reason is decidedly opposed to him, Scripture contradicts him, and as for the 39 Articles, he must be aware that many distinguished divines of the Episcopal Church, among whom we mention the venerable Paley, have considered them in the light of articles of *peace*, and that it was never expected that any *one* man should believe the whole, for they contain some hundred propositions, and some directly contradictory to others. We dismiss this part of the enquiry, by appealing to every candid man to say if reason shows him any thing in the infant sleeping in its mother's arms that seems to "deserve God's wrath and damnation"? We envy no man such views as these.—We abhor the creed which inculcates them.

The next thing worthy of notice in the article of the Watchman is, the very singular assertion that "Baptism is the *ordinary* and *only appointed* means by which God is graciously pleased to wash away the guilt of our pollution." What can the Editor mean here by the *guilt* or our *pollution*? And how is it that Baptism washes this away? We have shown that the infant has not any guilt; that he incurs no blame on account of his nature, or because his parents were sinful. But admitting he does, baptism cannot wash it away. Neither Scripture, reason, nor the Articles of the Episcopal Church warrant this assertion. The 27th Article represents Baptism as a "*sign* of regeneration," as the instrument by which the promises and our adoption to be sons of God are "visibly signed and sealed." According to the church, baptism cannot be any thing more than the sign of one's profession and the visible seal of what God has promised to bestow. It procures not the Divine favour, but is only the outward and visible sign or token.

The Watchman puts baptism in the place of circumcision, and considers its spiritual effect precisely the same. Will the Watchman plainly and specifically point out to us the spiritual effect which circumcision had on the children eight days old? If that removed the "guilt of pollution," how happened it that God was so peculiarly partial to the male children? Or are none but male children unholy by nature? Now we deny that circumcision had any spir-

itual effect other than to constitute the children circumcised heirs of the Jewish covenant. It entitled them to an earthly inheritance among the Jews and made them in due time members of the congregation of the Lord as it existed under the Mosaick law, but it had no reference to a future state. If the Watchman means that the baptism of infants only entitles them to the privileges of the church, or is a seal of their membership, when they shall be capable of understanding the nature of the obligations binding on them, we have no objection to his views. But if he extends the advantages of circumcision or of baptism beyond the present life, we call upon him to show the correctness of such views, or to establish the fact that either does thus extend, by an appeal to Scripture or to reason.

Thus far we have considered the Watchman's views of the nature with which children are born and the effect he supposes baptism will have on their spiritual condition. We come now to the enquiry what will be the *future* state of those infants who die unbaptized, before they can distinguish between good and evil. To this enquiry "we reply" says the Editor, "that we *believe* they will be pardoned, sanctified, and everlastingly saved, through the merits of Christ's atoning blood." *We* of course believe they will be saved, but we cannot discover with what propriety the Watchman can adopt this belief. According to his statements all infants before baptism deserve "God's wrath and damnation" and that in their "natural estate they are utterly unfit for the presence of a holy God." Does he believe these "unholy" infants, lying under the displeasure of God, deserving endless damnation, utterly unfit for the presence of a holy God, and dying in this awful condition, will be saved? Thus he asserts, and if he can believe this, it will require no great stretch of his faith to believe in universal salvation, for he will hardly contend that the worst among mankind deserve any thing more than God's wrath and damnation.

But if the Watchman be right in reference to the salvation of *infants*, we should think, did we believe in endless misery, that it were best to have all die in infancy, for then their salvation would be sure; whereas it is greatly "hazarded" by their growing up. And we are also unable to discover, in this view of the case what benefit baptism can be to an infant. If he dies in infancy without it, he can be saved, and if he dies with it he can only be saved. Or will the Watchman contend that a baptized infant will never be guilty of actual transgressions, or that God will not charge to his account the sin he may commit, if he shall have been baptized in his infancy?

But the Editor says "*pardoned.*" Here we ask, of what is the infant pardoned? He has no actual transgression, and the Watchman says by his creed "the truth of the Proverb is not allowed, that the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the *children's* teeth are set on edge," consequently by his own admission there can be no *original* guilt attached to the infant for which he needs pardon. Will the Watchman inform us of what the infant which dies in infancy is pardoned? From his account of the matter we can discover no fault in the child except he is born of human nature; which nature we have shown is not depraved, or if it be, in the words of Bishop Hobart we say, it is "our misfortune and not our crime."

The Watchman says, "the child shall not be condemned for the wickedness of another, which was entirely beyond his control and beyond his knowledge." But he has not told us, children, "all children without exception are born with an unholy nature—transmitted them as a necessary inheritance from sinful parents?" that the "fault and corruption of nature deserveth God's wrath and damnation?" Had the child any control, or any knowledge in determining with what nature he should be born? Will not the Watchman contend that all our actual transgressions proceed from our unholy nature, that if our nature was holy we should not sin? Yet will he say the child is not condemned for the fault of another? can there be unholiness without codemnation?

The Watchman, apparently aware that he had done away the necessity of infant baptism, intimates that the "*measure*" of the happiness of those infants which die in infancy unbaptized may be less than that of those which die baptized. But "the child shall not be condemned for the fault of another." How happens it then that the unbaptized infant is condemned to suffer a deprivation of happiness because he was not baptized? Will the Editor explain these things?

In summing up the advantages of infant baptism. He says, "it washes away *original* sin." What may this mean? Does the Editor mean it washes away the *pollution* which he supposes to attach to our nature? Certainly not. What then? the *guilt* of our pollution? What is that guilt? We have already shown that the infant is not guilty on this account, unless it be a crime to be born!

He remarks, it "brings them into covenant with the Lord, making them very members incorporate of his body, which is the church." If this means nothing more than that baptism makes them members of the church, we have no objections to offer. "It *seals* to them" he continues, "the promises of the Gospel, and gives them a title to the kingdom of heaven." And did those infants who died unbaptized go to heaven without a title?

But we forbear. We shall follow the Editor no further. We invite his attention to the *Scriptures* and to *reason*. It is of little consequence to us what may be the usages of any

church. We want Scriptural proof and rational argument.

[From the same.]

CHURCH AND STATE.

Mr. Editor,—I wish to call your attention, and through your useful paper, the attention of the publick generally, to the subject named in the words placed at the head of this article. Every careful observer of the times must be aware that this is no ordinary period. It is an age of bold and fearless discussion. Creeds, venerable for their antiquity, are attacked with a recklessness that seems determined to stop with nothing short of truth. Orthodoxy has taken alarm, and conscious of the weakness of her arguments, she seems determined to supply their deficiency by calling to their aid the whole weight of our civil institutions, and maintain her former popularity by obtaining the controul of every office in the gift of the people.

I have no wish to excite unnecessary alarm. But the evil consequences of a priestly establishment, are so numerous and so weighty, that we should be jealous of our rights and guard against every appearance of encroachment upon them by that class of people who have never had power without abusing it.

I do not think the orthodox are aiming at having their peculiar sentiments established by law. They are too well aware of the strong prejudices existing in this country against such establishment that they will not very soon, if ever, attempt it. But they are aiming at an object no less dangerous or pernicious. They intend, by concentrating their influence, by the aid of their various plans ostensibly for the evangelizing the world, by their Sabbath schools and home missions, to render it *unpopular* and extremely dangerous for a man to embrace or support any system but their own.

They intend to rule the government, by making all its officers *feel* that if they are not orthodox, they shall be removed,—and all wishing for office that they shall not be elected unless they pay homage to Orthodoxy.—Such controul may be very good, but for myself I shall oppose it, long as I can write, long as I can speak, or manifest any sign of disapprobation. Man should be free. He is beginning to acquire independence, but such controul would place him back in the days of monkish gloom. I wish, Mr. Editor, you would caution your readers on this subject, and bid them watch closely the movements of the Orthodox party. Yours, &c. O. A. B.

MONEY—NOT BIBLES.

It will be remembered, that a few weeks since, we published from the "Yeoman's Gazette" printed in Concord, Mass. an article communicating the information, that an Agent of the American Bible Society, who was soliciting *cash* in that town, refused a donation of new and neatly printed Bibles. From this we inferred the fact, that the object of these Agents is not to distribute the Scriptures, but to amass wealth in behalf of the parent institution. It was reported, on the appearance of this article in our columns, notwithstanding we gave it on the credit of another paper, that it was a sheer lie which we had fabricated, to bring the Bible Society into disrepute. This was tacitly confessing, that were the article true which we published, the inference we drew, was justifiable. The matter is now set at rest by the acknowledgment of Mr. GOULD, the Agent who refused the Bibles. He assigns his reason for refusing them, (and we give his own words) that "it was not *the object* of his visit to Massachusetts *to distribute the Holy Scriptures*, but *to collect funds* to sustain the American Bible Society, in their special exertions to introduce the sacred volume into all the destitute families in the United States." The fact then is acknowledged: this Agent did refuse the Bibles, and avowed his determination to receive nothing but Cash. We say, if the sole object of the Bible Society is to distribute the Bible, a donation in Bibles is more favourable to their object than a donation in Cash. The latter is what they wish, and the latter is what they get, and the latter is what they will continue to get, until people are more careful to know to what use their money will be applied. The Editor of the Yeoman's Gazette intimates, that this Agent receives "20 or 30 per cent on all cash collected," and that such "moderate per centage" does not "constitute his sole salary for his arduous labours." If this be true, the reason is obvious why he would not receive the Bibles, and why he wished to turn them off on to some other Society.—*Trumpet.*

COL. R. M. JOHNSON.

This Hon. gentleman is again elected to Congress. Strenuous efforts have been made all over our country, to injure his character, and prevent his holding a seat again within the walls of the Capitol. This was undoubtedly done, because the Orthodox are afraid of his influence, for they unquestionably intend to make a desperate effort to stop the Sunday Mails during the ensuing winter. His services, however, were duly appreciated by his constituents, and their approbation of his past course is now made manifest.

AVARICE OUTWITTED.

The case of John Ayre, Esq. who, though worth upwards of £30,000, was convicted at the Old Bailey, and sentenced to transportation, for stealing eleven quires of common writing paper, was rendered more memorable by the opportunity which it gave Junius to impeach the integrity of Lord Mansfield, who was supposed to have erred in admitting him

to bail. An anecdote is related of Eyre, which shows in a striking manner, the great depravity of the human heart; and may help to account for the meanness of the crime of which he stood convicted. An uncle of his, a gentleman of considerable property, made his will in favour of a clergyman, who was his intimate friend, and committed it to his custody, unknown to the rest of the family. However, not long before his death, having altered his mind with regard to the disposal of his wealth, he made another will, in which he left the clergyman only £500, leaving the bulk of his large property to go to his nephew and his heir-at-law, Mr. Eyre. Soon after the old gentleman's death, Mr. Eyre rummaging over his drawers, found this last will, and perceiving the legacy of £500 in it for the clergyman, without any hesitation or scruple of conscience, put it into the fire, and took possession of the whole effects, in consequence of his uncle being supposed to die intestate. The clergyman coming to town soon after, and inquiring into the circumstances of his old friend's death, asked if he had made a will before he died. On being answered by Mr. Eyre in the negative, the clergyman very coolly put his hand in his pocket, and pulled out the former will, which had been committed to his care, in which Mr. Eyre had bequeathed him the whole of his fortune, amounting to several thousand pounds excepting a legacy of £200 to his nephew.

[From the Christian Intelligencer.]

BEGGARS WITHOUT SHAME.

The orthodox have no bounds to their demands on the benevolence of the publick or of individuals. When they have wrested the last shilling from the hand of the poor, instead of taking shame to themselves in view of their conduct, they really seem to think they have done a meritorious act and lose no time in publishing it to the world as something greatly to their credit. At the late meeting of the N. H. Missionary Society, Mr. Storrs told a story about getting the last cheese from a mountain farmer who lived in a log house, which the Vermont Chronicle, and N. H. Observer, have published as something wonderfully excellent. It is in substance as follows. A Missionary Agent was directed by the minister of a certain town, on whom he had called for the necessary information to enable him to get money from the people, to call on an old man who lived on the top of a neighbouring mountain. Hoping to get something out of the poor man, "the agent toiled up the steep ascent, and approached his dwelling. It was built of logs, and the door was opened by a leather string." It appears that the old man was flattered by the visit, and probably wishing to be considered a very devoted christian, told the Missionary, in the cant language of the day, that he considered all he raised on his farm as the Lord's, that he did not feel at liberty to withhold it from Him when his ministers called for it, that he had given the Missionaries all that he had raised this year, having nothing left but his cheese. "It may be worth twenty-five dollars." The Missionary greedily seized the cheese and clambered down the mountain with it, congratulating himself on the good luck he had had, and considering himself well repaid for his fatigue. This disgraceful story was told and published in order to encourage other poor men to give all they raise to the Missionaries. *We* repeat the story to caution all honest farmers against a set of people who have no limits to their demands, and who are determined to take the last cent they can wrench from poor and hard labouring people, to support them in their idleness and extravagance.

[From the Religious Inquirer.]

SABBATH SCHOOL INSTRCTIONS.

Mr. Editor,—That Sabbath Schools, properly conducted may be very useful I have no doubt. That in the manner in which they *are* often conducted they have an injurious tendency is I think, equally certain and obvious.—Children, instead of being instructed in the principles of morality and religion, are studiously initiated into all the peculiarities of sectarian opinions and prejudices, and early taught to avoid and despise all those who do not embrace the dogmas of a particular creed. A few Sabbaths since, it is said, a Miss Betsey B—, a maiden lady of some distinction in the religious community, and a teacher of one of the orthodox Sabbath Schools in this city, was instructing her class in the meaning of the Scriptures, when a passage occurred in which false prophets are mentioned she asked a little girl of 8 or 9 years of age if she knew the meaning of the words *false prophets*? the pupil replying in the negative,—Why, (said the acute Instructress) a false prophet, means a false teacher, one that preaches false doctrine,—such an one as Mr. Rayner, (the Universalist preacher) he is a false prophet. It must be vastly important to the citizens of Hartford, and especially to the young children, as they are growing up, to have so eminent a female divine, always at hand, and easy of access, who can give a correct explanation of all parts of the Scriptures and illustrate their meaning by an easy and convincing appeal to circumstances, facts and characters! The little girl on returning home, inquired of her Aunt if Mr. RAYNER was a false prophet. On being asked why she made such an inquiry? Why, said she, Miss B—, says he is a false prophet.

A CITIZEN OF HARTFORD.

We give place to the foregoing communication without a word of comment, being willing that it should speak for itself.—*Ed. Inq.*

MEN RAISED BY MERIT.

Industry and application, are beautifully exemplified by the success of some of the greatest men in the civilized world, who have attained to eminence from obscurity and indigence. *Hutton*, the great geometrician, was a Coal-heaver. *Huddart*, the mechanist and mathematician, was a shoe-maker. *Brindley*, the Civil Engineer, who planned and executed the immense Canals of the Duke of Bridgewater, was an untaught common labourer. *Arkwright*, who invented the machinery of the Cotton mill, which eventually established the manufacturing pre-eminence of England, was a barber. Our own country too is prolifick of instances. *Franklin* was a journeyman printer; *Rittenhouse* was a plough boy; *Fulton*, the discoverer of the power of Steam and thereby the donor of one of the greatest gifts bestowed upon man, was a poor youth. *John Q. Adams* and *Wm. H. Crawford* spent the first years of manhood in "teaching the young idea how to shoot," and *Henry Clay*, *Daniel Webster*, and *Martin Van Buren* sprung from poverty.

Raleigh Register]

DIED—In the town of Bloomfield, (Michigan T.) Sept. 16th, LABAN JENKS, Esqr. in the fifty-eighth year of his age. Mr. Jenks had been labouring under a pulmonary disease for more than a year. In the month of July, 1828, he was taken bleeding at the lungs, which consequently notified him that his departure was at hand. Report, with her busy tongue had already said, "although he is a universalist yet you will see his faith in the goodness of his heavenly Father will forsake him." But he called a Methodist physician to witness his confidence in the faith once delivered to the Saints;—however for some wise purpose his life was spared until the present year, when it returned with tenfold force. Yet notwithstanding; he was fully prepared to meet the shaft of the grim monster; during the time of his last illness he was visited by a number of the usual soul-savers who were clothed with authority from their god to denounce endless damnation on all who do not receive the mark of the beast. But having his feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, and taking to himself the whole armour of HIS God, he was able to withstand in such an evil day, and having done all he did stand, the reports of his renunciation to the contrary notwithstanding. We assert this because our good orthodox friends have most basely reported a story that he renounced his faith, and called his family round him and warned them to abandon Universalism, and requested them to procure an orthodox priest to preach his funeral sermon, and that it was done accordingly. Now we know this to be most INFAMOUSLY FALSE, because it can be proved by eight substantial witnesses, that it is directly the reverse. Furthermore he gave directions the Saturday previous to Br. P. A. Day, a well known preacher of our order to deliver his funeral discourse from Job xiv. 10th verse and first clause of the 14th, and that he would publish the discourse, which may be expected shortly. The moral character of Esq. Jenks was unimpeachable, even his opponents admit that although he was a universalist, yet, to use their own phrase. "he was a nice old man."

At Mount Clemens, (M. T.) Sept. 25th, after a short illness of sixteen hours, HORATIO G. HASKINS, in the forty-seventh year of his age. Mr. Haskins was a firm believer in God's free grace. Funeral discourse by P. A. Day, from Jeremiah ix. 21.

Proposals for publishing by subscription, Letters on the immortality of the Soul, the intermediate state of the dead, and a future retribution.—Addressed to Mr. Charles Hudson, Westminster, Mass. By WALTER BALFOUR.

MY Essays, to which Mr. Hudson replies, were prepared without any reference to his opinions. But the appearance of his letters in 1827, in which my First Inquiry was attacked, in some degree altered their shape in publishing them. His present book is a professed reply to those Essays. It is divided into eight parts, to each of which, I shall devote one letter. To these shall be added, letters on Adam's original condition, as created an immortal being; the origin and progress of the doctrines concerning the immortality of the soul, an intermediate state of existence, and punishment after death, among the nations of the earth until the coming of Christ; state of these opinions at the commencement of the Gospel dispensation; state and progress of these opinions among Christians since; and concluding remarks on the present stage of the controversy concerning them.

My object in the proposed letters, is, to examine more fully the above three opinions for which Mr. Hudson contends, which, from the other subjects discussed in my Essays, and my limited number of pages, I was then prevented from doing. The new and curious matter, to be here introduced, swells these letters to an extent, the authour finds it impossible to condense. And he presumes, no reader for a small additional expense, would wish it suppressed. Not *precisely* knowing the number of pages his matter will fill, he is obliged to state his terms conditionally.

CONDITIONS—The work shall be handsomely printed in a 12mo. volume. If the pages do not exceed 300, the price to subscribers will be 80 cents in boards, bound $1. Should they amount to 360, or over, the price will be in boards $1, bound $1,25. Persons to whom subscription papers are sent, or any other persons, becoming responsible for six copies, shall receive a seventh gratis. Those inclined to favour the publication, are requested to return the amount of copies they will become responsible for to the authour, by the first of October, when the work shall be put to press. It is proposed to have it ready for sale in November.

As the Advocate is soon to be transferred, it is important to ascertain the responsibility of our subscribers. Those who have not paid at all, are therefore requested to make remittances as soon as possible. To facilitate collections, we will continue to receive $1,50 for the 7th Vol. if paid during this month, or so as to reach us in the month of November. After the 1st of December next two dollars will be exacted.

PUBLISHER.

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

A Pamphlet containing four Sermons on the evidences of Christianity. By W. F. REESE, for sale at this office. Oct. 31.

Poetick Department.

[From the Sentinel and Star in the West.]

ERE PHILOSOPHY.

What can we reason but from what we know? POPE.

Father, where is that burning lake they call
The home of sinners—hell?
Who call, my child?
Why, father, many. 'Twas but yesterday,
At church, I heard such tales of horrour told
About this burning flood, as made my cheek
Feel pale—and caused a shuddering chill to shoot
Across my heart! Where is it, father?—tell me.
Daughter, I do not know. What said they, child?
You do not know, dear father!—then I fear
Your soul will perish. Father, you *must* know!
Oh! 'tis a fearful gulf—and many fall
Into its depths forever. They are blind—
They know not where it is—they fear it not—
And heedlessly they wander: this is all
That shuts them out from heaven.
Is this *all?*
Did they not say that love to God and man—
That virtue, honour, and morality,
Might lead to life eternal? Did they not
Tell thee——
O, father! they said none of this.
They bade me shun that dark, that dismal lake,
The home of sinners. Oh! such tales of wo—
Of thousands pinioned in this burning hell,
And doomed to live. Of gnashing teeth, and cries,
And groans that knew no ceasing—red hot flames,
And snakes, and scorpions, and——
O, my child,
Cease this mad clamour. Did they tell thee, dear,
How they knew this?
O, yes! they had a book,
Like this big Bible—and they said that here
God's self had written it. It must be so—
They were good men, and tears stood in their eyes—
Surely, they *could not* lie!
No, child, not lie,
But they may be deceived.
Hush, father, hush—
How *dare* you reason thus? I fear for you!
They said that all who talked thus while on earth,
Should feel its flames hereafter.
Said they nought
Of the Omnipotent——
Who rules above
In yon blue heaven?——
Who ruleth *here*, my child,
Within this heart! who ruleth every where—
From whom all good proceeds—whose being is
Eternal—and whose *essence is the life*,
The living principle, of man!
Oh, no!
They said he ruled above—that he was just,
All-merciful, and good: That he would bring
Those whom he loved—who hated and despised
That burning lake, and Satan who ruled there—
To life eternal, and would hurl the rest
Into that burning lava. This were hard;
I'm sure that I should die. But no, they said
That we would burn, and burn, *and still live on,*
And never die! Oh! this were hard indeed—
Sure God is not so cruel—but I fear
'Tis true—they said so.
They *said* so, my dear?
Ay, they said so—and this is all. They know
Nought of the *future*. All is but a dream,
An idle fancy. And this burning hell
Is of their own imagining. But God
Is of himself, and just.
Father, good night!
My heart feels sick and faint. I go to bed,
But fear I cannot sleep. Methinks that dreams,
Black dreams of horrour, will flit o'er my brain—
And phantom forms, fresh from this burning hell,
Crowd round my couch! and I will wake in tears.
Good night, dear father.
Spurn such thoughts, my child—
Good night. Oh, hapless innocent! and have
They wrought upon thee with such tales as these—
Such wild creations of disordered fancy?
O MIND! thou art debased!—thy nobler powers
Are used to make a tyrant of a God.
Is this the ministry that now goes forth
To preach "glad tidings" *not* "to all," but some?
"Free grace to" whom they please; a hell to those
Who help not fill their coffers! Canting knaves!
Are these the followers of the lowly Jesus?
Teach they the precepts that he taught? or kneel
They to his God, or Mammon? They would bind
The mind immortal in their shackles—drive
The soul to madness and despair—and check
Its fervent aspirations after heaven!
O, grand Hypocrisy! thou fain would'st give
Man's soul a place in the eternal heavens,
Not for the *love* of *God*, but for the *fear*
Of *hell!* Oh, man! man! man!
My cheek is burning with the shame it feels
That thou can'st "play such tricks before high Heaven."

RODERICK.

[From the American Traveller.]

I DO NOT ASK.

I do not ask, that fortunes beams
May shine unbroken on my way;
I did not ask, that pleasure's gleams
May dart their radiance o'er my day.

I do not ask, that power of fame,
May raise me to the monarch's throne,—
For each is but an empty name,
A breath of air by Fancy blown.

I ask not that a wav'ring world,
Should e'er to me in homage bow:
Or that its wreath may ne'er be hurl'd,
To blast my hopes, or cloud my brow.

I do not ask, that dark deceit
May never throw his chains e'er me,
Or that in life I ne'er may meet
With sorrow, or from want be free.

I ask, but for a humble lot,
And what but Heaven alone can send,
A talisman, that faileth not,—
A true and sympathetick friend.

To whom my thoughts I might reveal,
Who might my heart's deep secrets know,
Who'd feel whatever I should feel,
Of pain or pleasure, joy or wo.

A friend, whose soothing, cheering voice,
Might raise my spirit, in despair;
Who would in all my joys, rejoice,
And lighten life's dull load of care.

With such an one, I'd fearless tread
The mazy, mystick path of life;
Then peacefully recline my head
Upon death's pillow, free from strife.

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

O. A. BROWNSON, EDITOR.

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1829. [NO. 23.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

Delivered in the Second Universalist Church, in Boston, Sunday morning, October 4, 1829.

BY O. A. BROWNSON.

"If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say to this mountain, remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove."—Matt. xvii. 20.

I am no great advocate for the marvelous. I have read of numerous prodigies which, it is said were once very common, and things and events for which there was no assignable cause; but I generally read them with much incredulity. Nature is indeed wonderful. She presents many examples of lawless capriee ; but I require very strong evidence to convince me, that can take place, which in naturally impossible.

Much is said of the wonders performed by faith, and much too which baffles my credulity. Much doubtless, faith has done, and perhaps it may do more ; but I do not believe it can remove a literal mountain, and, with all due deference to our text, I do not believe a man can remove a mountain by preaching to it or by commanding it to remove, however strong may be his faith.

I do not mean to dispute the declarations of Scripture, but I must see those declarations somewhere near probability or I cannot believe them. How faith "like a grain of mustard seed" can have power to produce such astonishing results, is more than I can conceive, and he who can believe thus, is more fit to become the inmate of an insane hospital than a teacher of mankind.

But the lesson of our text is true, and the principle it discloses is of high importance. For it is capable of being practically developed in almost every department of life. The text should not be too strictly construed. Christ was exhorting his disciples, encouraging them to engage with ardour in the work of emancipating the world. He reproved them for their faint heartedness, and their want of confidence. The work which the Saviour had commenced seemed too great. Its magnitude rose like some lofty mountain. They trembled as they surveyed the broadness of its base and the sublimity of its top. They despaired of being able to go round it, and to find a passage over it, seemed to them impossible. It was to dissipate the gloom which began to brood over the minds of his disciples, and to buoy up their drooping spirits, that the Saviour pronounced our text.

The difficulties the Saviour had to encounter were of no ordinary character. They were great and manifold. They were insuperable to timorous spirits, and could be overcome only by bold and untiring efforts. The feeble soul who should despair of success, would give up the contest. But he who wished for success, who felt confident of victory, whose eye rested solely on the triumph to be achieved, would attack the difficulties, with such zeal and invincible resolution, that the mountain should sink, the obstacles be removed, and the rough places become smooth.

I consider the text a pardonable hyperbole, or a sentence conveying, under the pomp of oriental metaphor, a lesson always important and always necessary to success in the affairs of life. I shall not attempt to state how much faith it requires to equal a grain of mustard seed, nor shall I appeal to the dicta of sacred or profane authours to prove the correctness of the doctrine I labour to establish. I wish to "come home to men's bosoms and business," to make my hearers feel the force of what I say, by an appeal to what they see and know.

Let the merchant engage in trade without any confidence of success, and you may vouch for his failure. If the Agriculturalist believes he shall rear no crop he will sow with a sparing hand and have to beg in harvest. It is so ordered man must look forward ; and experience proves that his labours will be proportioned to his confidence, they will not be in vain. We live not in the present. Our minds are constantly rushing into the future, and we are constantly expecting something not yet obtained. That man is most wretched who despairs of success, who believes every exertion he makes will be fruitless. And how feeble will be those exertions ! The mind becomes enervated. An imbecility of resolution paralyzes the arm, and the poor faint hearted wretch, who wants spirit to attack the evils of his condition, sinks down and fails of doing, what with other views and feelings, he might easily have done.

In the various adventures of life, we see the necessity of relying on the future. The student says to himself, "I despair of literary fame. Others indeed, have toiled, but they

have raised such a mountain of literary glory, that I cannot hope to rise above, nor even ascend its height." He accordingly wastes his time; the spring of his exertions is broken, the volume is cast aside, and he grows up, ignorant, farthest removed possible from what a laudable ambition and a just confidence of success, might have made him. In military life, the same principle is forcibly illustrated. Let an army faint hearted, despairing of success, face another, at once high spirited and confident of victory and you may easily foretell the result of the engagement. The attack of the first will be feeble as its hopes, and all its movements will be governed by the imbecility of its resolutions.

Let any one go into society with the wish to please, and although without modesty he will soon disgust, he will also find that he must have some confidence in his own ability, and must feel tolerably certain of success or he will fail. The same is true in point of morals. But here I mention a mistake, very common and one which I deem it important to correct. It is a very popular doctrine, to decry human nature and to teach individuals to despise themselves. Our clergy, for some good reasons we hope, though we suspect for some selfish ones, have taught us to distrust ourselves and not to rely on our own powers. Man is, indeed, a vain foolish being. Forgetful of his own weakness, he rises disdainful of earth—attacks heaven by storm and seems determined to invade the secret apartments of the Divinity. A being of a day, he discourses of eternity; ignorant of men, he talks eloquently of angels and of Gods; unacquainted with earth, he attempts a topographical description of heaven and of hell,—here points out the dwelling of the blest, and there fixes the abodes of the damned; above realities he flies off into the region of fiction, gives loose to his imagination and amuses us with a fairy world; not having learned, there are some things he can, and some things which he cannot know, he idly wastes his time in reaching after that which must forever elude his grasp. But setting aside this vanity he may be much. Man may be a noble being. By a due developement of his mental energies, he may rise far above that low and painful state in which he now is bound.

But he is told a different tale. His powers are decried; his reason is condemned, his ability to become good is denied, and he is told he must think meanly of himself; that he must put his hand upon his mouth and his mouth in the dust and cry "unclean, unclean." I have listened to this lesson. But with emotions too painful to be described. Man, allied to heaven, lord of the earth, a "paragon of beauty," a countenance seeking the throne of God, and a mind that bids defiance to time and space, must be debased, and he must thus debase himself!

Go to the immoral, tell them to despise themselves—labour to destroy all self respect, and you may look in vain for reformation though you stun them with the thunders of God Almighty's wrath and harrow up their minds with the miseries of the damned. Let the offender feel confidence in himself that he can retrieve his character, and he will do it. But destroy that confidence, his iniquity rises like a mountain before him. The torrent rushes down, he starts back, desponding, cries "I cannot remove it." Give him faith like a "grain of mustard seed," inspire him with confidence that he may succeed, and he will say to the mountain "be thou removed" and it shall obey.

You will not misunderstand me. I do not mean man need not depend on his Creator for assistance, nor do I mean to lessen the worth of the Gospel. It is difficult enough to reform mankind with all the help we can get. What I mean is, that a just self respect is important, yea absolutely necessary to the promotion of virtue, or to the production and preservation of moral goodness. Mankind are sinners, no one can deny it. This has been for ages, thundered in our ears, and with it, we have been taught, we are totally depraved, incapable of a good thought or of performing a single commendable action. We have been told, we are miserable in consequence of our sinfulness, and exhorted to reform, urged to it, by all our love of happiness. But how can we reform? or with what spirit can we attempt the work, when we are told we cannot, that we are as a man plunged in the mire every exertion we make but sinks us deeper? What consistency is there to tell a man he can do nothing which is good, and then to call upon him to perform good works?

Man is a sinner. He ought to reform, ought to become righteous, and if he cannot throw off his sinful character and become good, vain is our preaching, useless all our exhortations, threats or persuasions. I believe he *can* reform. "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect," "cease to do evil and learn to do well." Are we thus commanded? And are we thus commanded, when we have no ability to obey? No. It would impeach the character of God, and drive man to despair to assert it. Man can become better. Let him feel this important truth, let him learn to place a just confidence in himself, and to believe he can do what his God requires of him; and he will commence the work with a resolution, with a zeal and determined perseverance that shall remove every obstacle, and sweep the mountain of sin into the ocean to be lost in its depths.

This same principle, to wit, confidence that our exertions will be successful, is equally important when labouring to destroy errour and build up truth. If we turn our eyes once more to the obstacles which rose to obstruct the in-

tre luction of the Gospel, and the spread of that mild and benevolent system of religion taught by the Nazarene Reformer, we may easily discover the necessity of this firm reliance on final success, to prompt the necessary exertions.

There is nothing more really glorious than reformation, no work can awaken more noble and generous emotions, or more readily call into action all the better principles of our nature, than that of meliorating the condition of mankind. Yet there is no work more dangerous, or more ungrateful at the time it is commenced. It cannot be done without attacking existing institutions, nor without awakening the prejudices of the age in which we live. Notwithstanding Christ was commissioned by Almighty God—notwithstanding he came in all the mildness of love, and in all the gentleness of compassion, he aroused the pride of the Pharisees, he called forth the bigotry of the religionists of his age, and armed the intolerance of his nation against him.

The doctrines he taught were of a character so repugnant to those of his countrymen, his morality was so pure in its nature, so benevolent in its requisitions, that they felt their own discernment and goodness reproved by its promulgation. Hence they rose in arms against him. They set on foot a malicious espionage and sought to entrap him in his words; they watched his conduct if by any means they could find ought to impeach; & when truth was wanting they could draw upon the ample stores of falsehood. And this they did do. Because he was not an ascetick, because he did not deny himself food and drink, they call him a "glutton" and a "wine bibber." Because he laboured to reform the vicious and to raise the moral character of publicans and sinners, they called him licentious, and branded his doctrine as one calculated to open the floodgates of iniquity, and to deluge the land with every species of vice. Acting upon these false accusations as if they were true, they called down the thunders of the God of Abraham to blast him for his audacity, stirred up the fears of a fickle and jealous government, and established every false and ungenerous prejudice that malice could grasp or cunning invent.

Was not here a mountain to remove? Here a man must lose every thing. He who engages in a work like this must lose the affection of father and mother, must find himself discarded by brother and by friend, compelled to bare his bosom to the shafts of a busy, powerful and enraged enemy. The whole weight of popularity is thrown in against him, the whole weight of ancient prejudice bears him down.—He must stand alone, or be grieved by the timorous and faint hearted conduct, and sometimes unwise management of those who profess to be his friends and to aid his cause. Thus situated what but faith in ultimate success can support him? Say that Jesus had, surveying this mountain of difficulties despaired, would he have ever proclaimed his doctrine? would he have ever established that system of religion, which exalts man and does honour to his Creator? Never. But thanks be to God, the assurance was given, he should not "fail nor be discouraged till he set judgment in the earth, and the Isles should wait for his law"

Had the Apostles been discouraged by the impediments thrown in their way by the folly, the vice and bigotry of the age, would they have faced the dangers which every where awaited them? Would they have confronted the boasting Pharisee, the intolerant bigot, and the persecuting superstitionist? Would Paul have endured the perils of his countrymen, the perils of false brethren, of the sea and the tempests, of the enraged multitudes which sought his life? No; he would have sunk under them. But confident the Lord of hosts was with them and that their labours would be crowned with the joy of the whole earth, the apostles went forward, danger gave them courage, opposition nerved them to their work and called forth exertions which may well astonish the world and awaken a just ambition to follow their example.

And derive we, my brethren, no encouragement from that example, and does our subject offer us no argument for exertion? Before us stands the huge mountain of pretended Orthodoxy, rearing its aged head to the clouds and covering more than half the earth with the broadness of its base. To appearance a bare and rugged rock, grand indeed from the immensity of its mass, and venerable for the ages it has withstood the lightnings of heaven and defied the attacks of time. We tremble before it. We exclaim "it is lasting as the earth. It is rooted in hell and its top reaches to heaven. Huge torrents of fire pour down from its rugged sides and form a bulwark around it. Who can hope to approach it, who can ascend it, or who can hope to remove it? Thousands have attempted it, and thousands have failed in the attempt. It sends forth a withering blast and we sink ere we can survey its magnitude, or learn a passage round it." Shall we faint? Orthodoxy in her pride may vaunt her strength, she may exclaim, "my mountain stands strong; it has stood the wreck of ages, and seen kingdom after kingdom crumbled to ruin. It has seen generations come and generations pass off. It has smiled at the rage of man and laughed at the fury of the heavens. Yea, and it shall stand and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Ah! let her boast, a voice of the Holy One is already heard; the command is given, "turn her boasting majesty into the field, to dwell with beasts till she learn the heavens do rule." Ah friends, tremble you at that mountain? Had you faith like a grain of mustard seed you might say unto it, "be thou removed" and it should obey. "For who art

thou O great mountain that risest before Zerubbabel, thou shalt become a plain, and the headstone shall be brought forth, shouting grace, grace unto it."

But to drop the figure. False doctrines now prevail. Errour spreads her gloomy reign—man is unholy and unhappy. We see the evil—we regret it, but its power is so great we dread to wage war against it. If we enter the lists with prevailing systems, we fear we shall fail. Our cause may be unpopular, we may suffer the loss of friends, of patronage, and of much we hold dear, without gaining the object we have in view. Hence we are feeble in our attacks, and hence more than half who wish well to our cause dare not avow their predilection. They say we shall fail, and support that which they believe to be false, and prevent the triumph of truth by aiding and abetting its enemies. Hence we do little which might be accomplished, if we were only confident of final success. Had each one who wishes Universalism may prevail, faith like a "grain of mustard seed," the everlasting mountain of self-styled orthodoxy would be removed, the glory of God would burst upon the world, and benighted man would feel himself in the embrace of the Godhead—nature would be clothed with new verdure, every object would wear a smile of joy, and "peace on earth, and good will to men," would reign triumphant.

And we may have this courage. The errours of the past shall teach us wisdom—many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall increase. God has renewed his covenant with man. The time shall come when we shall not say every man to his neighbour, and to his brother, "Know ye the Lord," for all shall know him from the least to the greatest, and the knowledge of the Lord shall fill the whole earth as the waters do the sea. Encouraging thought! How grand, how animating the prospect. I look down the stream of time—I see errour after errour exploded—truth after truth breaking in glory upon once benighted man. I see individual after individual returning from his exile—family after family, nation after nation, and one quarter of the globe after another, bursting its fetters till all shall be free, and raise the song of grateful triumph to Him who hath redeemed and to the God who delights to beautify. O could I see that time now arrived, and that felicity so great enjoyed. But posterity shall find it, and the thought that I may hasten its approach, inspires me with courage to go forward, to labour with joy unspeakable for that great emancipation which, as sure as God is love and the laws of nature remain unaltered, will, one day be gained. O may each of us take courage, and go forward with such invincible resolution that all obstacles shall be removed and man become regenerated and happy. Which may God grant. Amen.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Editor:—The 4th No. of the present volume of the Advocate contains a letter from the first society of Universalists in Bloomfield, stating the progress of our cause together with the doings and progress of Methodism. We stated that we were informed by their own disciples that they had not made one solitary proselyte. Now a number of respectable witnesses stated at that time to me, that they with their own ears heard the presiding elder make the following observations in a prayer, "O Lord, must we go from this place without one solitary proselyte." Now sir, notwithstanding not less than ten of these witnesses are ready to testify on oath that they heard all this, some of the Methodist have the unparalleled effrontery to deny it. Yea, they have gone so far as to deny that any debates were held on the ground, when some of the very characters who deny it, themselves held debates with our brethren. But they knowing their denial to be disgracefully barefaced, meanly undertook to quibble on the term "debates," saying that they were nothing more than disputes. I am not very learned, but on referring to Dr. Johnson's dictionary, I find his definition of the word debate to be thus, "Debate, s. a dispute a contest a quarrel." "Debate, v. to deliberate to dispute to argue. Now in the face and eyes of all these facts they affirm that we signed a libel, besides uttering a number of other slanders, which begin already to be more profit than harm, for our cause triumphs gloriously. Br. P. A. Day has come among us and has been perambulating for several weeks past in Wayne and St. Clair counties, and returns with the cheering news that our brethren are unexpectedly numerous.

The conduct of our Methodist brethren determined me to visit their camp-meeting this year in person, and accordingly on the twenty seventh of June I attended; and must confess that I was truly astonished to witness the management and manoeuvering to gain proselytes, as never having been a spectator in the camp of Israel before, it will be impossible to describe all I saw, but the most prominent performances I will endeavour to state, together with a delineation of the camp. Firstly then we will imagine a row of pens enclosed on three sides with rails, leaving the front open, the tops covered with boards, so as to form something like a shed, but in their dialect it is called a tent; all these pitched on the declivity of a small hill verging into a musqueto swamp. The "sacred stand" as they very often termed it, in the centre, built in such a manner that its back should stand to the south with the roof projecting over the front so far as to cover the head of the priest from the rain and also to prevent Sol from darting his fiery rays on *their* backs, while they were pouring down red hot

lava from the "roused ocean of deep hell" on the backs of the mud-turtle race below. Stop! Mr. reader dont be disgusted yet, read on to the end of the chapter, and then you will know my authority for calling them mud-turtles.—After the priest had finished his harrangue he could just step down a few steps into a small apartment where they could (as an old lady states she saw and heard) chuckle at the observations he heard from the "sacred stand," aye if they did not I wonder greatly at their gravity, for of all expressions that ever I heard some of the most queer were uttered there.—But to go on with the delineation. In front of the stand were four crotches stuck, with three poles laid so as to form a pew or square yard, with the side open next to the stand, this they called an "altar." The performances were something like the following: A long tin horn (in their dialect a trumpet) was sounded to denote that a sermon was about to be delivered. The sermonizer makes his appearance, and proceeds to business, his text for instance is "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," &c. After expatiating on the glorious scheme of gospel grace with unusual eloquence, he seems all at once to be filled with wrath and vengeance; he immediately dresses God in the same habiliments, Sinai's awful thunder roils, darts of endless damnation are hurled with indiscriminate fury, the "roused ocean of deep hell" boils with tenfold rage, whilst the saints all this time are manifesting the deepest distress—not for themselves—but those who are so stupid as not to feel the force of such warm argument. The sermon is generally followed by an exhortation of the same shape. In one of which a preacher by the name of Janes, offered us proof positive from analogy, that wrath and destruction were more profitable in winning souls to God than preaching love. I distinctly remember his system of proof. After a few observations by way of introduction, he says "Some people think we do wrong in preaching the terrours of Mount Sinai instead of the love of God to sinners, but I must beg leave to differ from them on this ground. There is the turtle or terrapin, as some call it, you may stand and preach the love of God to him till you are grown gray with age, and he would not run his head out, but you clap a coal of fire on his back, and he would soon stick it out; yes my friends, I say hell-fire should be applied to the sinner," &c. There it is Mr. Editor, verbatim as he delivered it. Now we think that it would not be presuming too much to suppose that this sagacious little gentleman had tried the experiment, for I understand that Romans viii. 20, has reference to the brutes as well as to mankind by his interpretation of it. Perhaps if I should suggest to the gentleman a small improvement in his discovery, he and his brethren might make more proselytes next year than they did this, for I am inclined to think their converts were few and far between this year. We imagine that he might have preached hell-fire to the mud-turtle with as little success as the love of God, without a literal application whereby we would recommend an actual application of it in order to test the experiment faithfully. Another reason why we suggest this course is this, all the terrours of Mount Sinai written in my bible contain not one *spark* of hell fire. After such enticing exhortation were ended a priest cries out for all those who have felt the force of the hell-fire heat to come forward to the *altar*, and be prayed for. And if none came forward, a second heat is taken and so forth and so on until the end of the meeting. If what is here written should appear too ludicrous for publication, you are at liberty to curtail any part or the whole, but be assured that it is not representing them half so silly as they appeared. *An eye and ear witness.*

JUSTICE.—A missionary beggar lately met two young girls in N. York, and discovered rings on their fingers—they have an astonishing perception of gold—succeeded by persuasion and threats in robbing them of the rings and securing them in his Missionary box—all for the salvation of souls. On being informed of the facts, the father brought an action against the minister for swindling, carried him into the ungodly tribunals of N. York, established the fact of his imposition by evidence and had him legally punished for his villinay. This was persecuting poor saints for conscience sake.—*Trumpet and Magazine.*

To the Genesee Association of Universalists.

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN,

This is to inform you that I now withdraw myself from your Association as a minister of the Gospel, this is not done because I have met with any change in sentiments, but on account of my health. My health is such that I can not attend to the duties of the ministry. It is painful to me in many respects to give up the glorious work, but still I feel it my duty so to do. I have had great comfort and consolation in preaching the glorious gospel of a risen Saviour: how far my conduct and conversation has corresponded with the Gospel I have preached, I must leave with those who are best acquainted with me to decide. I am deeply sensible myself that in very many instances I have deviated from the wisdom which is from above and have been too much conformed to the wisdom of this world—still I hope that I have not disgraced the good cause I have been engaged in trying to promote. I wish to have it understood both by friends and enemies that I remain a firm and unwavering believer in the final holiness and consequent happiness of the whole human family. I believe the doctrine of an endless Hell to be a damnable heresy and that it originated in heathenism and priestcraft; it had for its foundation ignorance, pride, superstition and wickedness; it has the same now for its support. I pray God that the time may soon come when the human

amily shall be delivered from the delusion of uch a belief. It is with tender feelings I proeed to bid the Universalist connexion fare well as a Minister of the Gospel. I have minled in the society of your families, eat and rank at your tables, and lodged in your hositable mansions. Many of you have been ind and benevolent to me: it occurs to me rethren and sisters that as respects many of ou I shall never see your faces again on earth.) how consoling the recollection, and how weet the contemplation of the fact, that by nd by, yes, when we shall be made alive in Christ, when he shall see of the travel of his oul, and shall be satisfied; then we shall all eet again beyond this world of disappointent, trial, sickness and death, we shall meet vith our blessed Redeemer, who shall with nat soft hand that was once nailed to the Cross ipe tears from off all faces and bid us a happy elcome to immortality and eternal life. I hall close this letter with the language of the reat Apostle to the Gentiles, 2d Cor. xiii. 11, Finally Brethren farewell, be perfect, be of ood comfort, be of one mind, live in peace, nd the God of love and peace shall be with ou."

HENRY ROBERTS.

Rochester, Nov. 2, 1829.

Mr. Editor—The writer of this article reently made a tour through the counties of Erie nd Crowford, Pa. and preached a dozen disourses to serious and attentive audiences. In he village of Erie, we had a large and respecble assembly, who generally appeared of the rst class. The doctrine appears to be new most of them, and as I left them the next orning, I know not how they received the ord, but think favourably. I also visited leadville, and preached to a very large conregation in the Presbyterian meeting house Friday evening. This house was built by ubscription to be open for all denominations, xcept when the Presbyterians occupied it ith their regular meetings. My appointment as made Friday evening at the request of a Ir. Huidekoper a gentleman whose education, ealth, manners, and moral character, give m the first rank among the gentlemen of the est; he had paid about $1,000 towards the ouse, and requested me to preach in the house 2, P. M. on Sunday, as the Presbyterians ly held one service in the day, accordingly, y notice was given on Friday evening, but on aturday, a Mr. Bushnel the Presbyterian ergyman, made an appointment for the afterpon, and called a professor of the College to reach on the death of a child which he had st a week or two before; thus we were frusated, but we were kindly offered the use of e Methodist place of worship. There seemto be a general burst of indignation at the al Calvinistick conduct of the Presbyterians, d I mistake, if they do not find by experience that "the wicked are snared in the work of their own hands." LEWIS C. TODD.

Chautauque, Oct. 30*th*, 1829.

Miss Frances Wright has politely favoured us with the following extract from her last lecture at Utica. It deserves attention; and if attended to we think it would prompt enquiry and lead to some useful result. Ed.

Utica comprises a population of eight or ten thousand. Its rise and progress in wealth and industry has been unusually rapid. It is finely situated; commands, by means of the canal, an easy communication with the most distant parts of the union; is the centre of a productive and fast improving country, and of an active, intelligent and fast growing population. Under these circumstances have the people of Utica been inattentive to the means they possess for improving their own moral condition as well as that of the country through which extends their influence? In studying the appearance of their village it must be confessed they have not been idle. To a population of 8,000 they have 13 churches, support from 18 to 20 religious preachers of different persuasions, 9 religious sunday schools, 4 religious missionary funds, two religious tract funds, 1 bible and common prayer book fund, another fund for "the education of indigent pious young men fitting for the gospel ministry," a maternal association fund for the purpose of improvement in the religious education of the children of the members. Extra of all these expenditures of more local application and influence, the people of Utica patronize what is termed Western Sunday School Union, embracing 17 counties, 1,074 schools, 7,548 teachers, and 47,000 scholars. Which said Western Sunday School Union has undertaken to supply every child within the limits of the society with a copy of the Bible; this of course at the expense of the people resident within the limits of said society. Also, the citizens of Utica patronize the Oneida co. Sabbath School Union, auxiliary to the Western already noted. Also, the citizens of Utica patronize a branch of the great N. Y. city American tract society, embracing 17 adjacent counties. Also, the citizens of Utica patronize the Oneida co. auxiliary foreign missionary society. Also, the citizens of Utica patronize the western domestic missionary society, for the purpose of supplying with stated preaching the destitute within its borders. Also, the citizens of Utica patronize the Oneida Evangelical association to assist resident ministers during the pressure of revivals.

I have taken these notes from the directory of the town, in which may be seen as many more associations, male and female, as those I have enumerated. Nor is there one among them, I will be bold to assert, let its ostensible object be what it may, charitable or educational, that is not based upon sectarian principles,

and calculated so as to uphold, directly or indirectly, the influence of the clergy, and to cloud the understandings, mislead the sympathies, corrupt the integrity and break down the republican spirit of the community.

Let the people of Utica calculate the expenses with which they have allowed themselves to be saddled for the benefit of the clergy under the plea of religion. I cannot estimate the direct cost of your priests and churches alone, at any thing short of 50,000 dollars per annum. I have heard indeed that some of your churches have not been, nor are ever likely to be, paid for. A circumstance which might give rise to some other reflections; such as on whom falls the loss; whether it is not on the hard-working mechanick—upon whom, as of yore, scribes and pharisees lay heavy burdens which they touch not with one of their fingers.

But without attempting to develope all the consequences involved in the great scheme of priestcraft, I will request you at your leisure, to investigate them for yourselves. If a similar investigation be called for every where, such is more especially called for here. Thirteen churches and little short of twenty preachers to a population of 8 or 9,000! And what churches! One alone capable of containing 3,000 individuals! Truly, my friends, all that I have seen; to say nothing of what I have heard and read, touching the religious extravagancies of the Utica community have disposed me to rub my eyes, in donbt if I were not dreaming. I have read the accounts of your revival—But I will not recal a scene which all doubtless would wish forgotten.

Those who have followed me through the introductory course I have now closed, must I think be satisfied that the present outlays of this community have been entirely misapplied. And those who will look round upon the face of things and upon the face of each other, will, I think be satisfied that this misapplication of their wealth and energies is fast tending to deprive them of common sense, social happiness and all liberty whatsoever.

I have seen human beings both under the excitement, and under the depression of superstition; for with superstition, as with the ague, there is always the hot and cold fit, and the unhappy victim of the mental as of the physical malady, is alternately in the frenzy of visionary exstacy and in the chill of helpless despondence. This I have seen elsewhere; but the moment of delirium is past in Utica. The mania is expended, and it is rather the effects of past excesses, than the excesses themselves which are observable at the present time. But if these be past there exists every means requisite for their renewal. The popular delusion lasted sufficiently long for the tribe of Levi to root themselves fast in the soil, and to fix the throne of their dominion at the secret fire-side of every citizen. In the way of clerical influence I have marked nothing to compare to what I witness here. The priest hath set his seal on every forehead, his padlock on every lip and his grasp on every pocket. Each man fears a spy in his wife, an enemy in his neighbour, or loss of bread as well as a good name, shall he breathe a doubt respecting the saving efficacy of all the jugglery, grimace, and absurdity, which while he hates and despises he consents to countenance and support.

I pray you to look arcund you; to see things as they are, to examine each of you your own feelings, and to judge if what is now passing about and within you be consistent with common sense and your national institutions. What are you all doing? for what are you all praying? to what are you all submitting? Is it for fellow citizens to subdivide themselves into Catholicks, and Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, and Congregationalists, and Baptists, and Methodists, and Universalists, and I know not what other distinctions without meaning? Is it for fellow citizens I say, and fellow creatures to call themselves by these foolish appellations and then to think themselves all-wise unto salvation, whilst no two are agreed as to the mode of salvation, and while the wisdom of each is foolishness to all the others? Is it for rational beings to hire men expressly to set the whole community by the ears, and to raise at their request more edifices than would contain the whole population; the same to stand empty six days out of seven and when filled to be filled only for purposes which could better be done at home. Or is it I would ask for Republicans to live in absolute fear of their own thoughts, and to humour the whims and build up the power of a body of men who, in secret, must smile at the very credulity, which admits their pretensions or the timidity which fears to challenge them.

I do request you citizens of Utica to pass in review the state of things in your town. Less than 70,000 dollars cannot here be expended directly or indirectly for religious purposes. We have seen during our investigations in this place that all such disposals of money, to say nothing of what is more precious—time, is at once mischievous and absurd. If so what must be the mischief done and doing in this town, and what the absurdity exhibited!

I hope I shall have offended no one by these plain observations. I know them to be well intended and you can judge of their truth.

TEMPERANCE.

Money is necessary in the promotion of almost all the philanthropick plans of the day, except the temperance cause. This wants no money to advance it. This enterprize must move on without money. Let no person travel thro' our country, to beg for this cause. It will not do. It will damp the noble ardour that now prevails.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

UNION OF PAPERS.

It has been already announced to our readers that the Gospel Advocate and Evangelical Magazine are to be united at the close of the present volume and only one paper published. This arrangement will be attended with many advantages which our readers can appreciate as well as ourselves. The union is a friendly one, and brought about by the most amicable means, and the writer of this trusts it will be for the general good of the cause to which both papers are now attached.

The Editor of the Gospel Advocate perceives that many of his friends have supposed that he is to be retained as one of the future editors, but they will learn from the prospectus that such is not the case. With the seventh volume ends his career as a *Universalist* Editor. His future course he is not at liberty to state, but he will add that if he lives the publick will learn what that course is. It is with no pleasant emotions that he announces that he must after three numbers more take his leave of the kind friends who shall have followed him through this volume. He says *friends* for such he calls his readers. Feeling himself a friend to them he trusts that they will consider that if he have touched their prejudices or probed their hearts it was for their good rather than for his own. The cry of infidelity has been raised against him, but this is nothing strange, he was prepared to hear it; and if he has shown some impatience it must be set down to early habit rather than to his philosophy or his wish to be severe.

Of Mr. Skinner the contemplated future editor I have little to say. He has been longer known to this publick than myself. He is a man of moral worth, good abilities, and a sound, orthodox Universalist.—His faith in the Divine authenticity of the Bible and firm conviction in the final salvation of all men, will, probably, spare him those censures which it has been my lot to share. I wish not to overrate nor undervalue any man's character. But I think Mr. Skinner entitled to the confidence of community as a judicious *Universalist* Editor. He takes the Advocate with my good wishes for his success, and however different may be his course and mine hereafter, I shall always feel proud of his friendship.

The subscribers to the Gospel Advocate will perceive that the transfer made by the present publisher requires that those who have unsettled accounts with him should immediately attend to them for it is necessary that the business be closed as soon as possible. The publisher has some thousands of dollars now standing in small sums all over the country. It is desirable that those who owe these sums should feel themselves from the principles of common justice, religion, or honour, bound to pay them. If our subscribers are unable to pay we know not how to excuse them; they should have informed us of the fact. If they are able to pay but *will* not we leave it to them to say what should be our opinion respecting them.—EDITOR.

UNIVERSALISM IN ALBANY.

It is with pleasure that we announce to the Universalist publick, that a few spirited individuals in Albany, N. Y. have erected a very neat and convenient house for religious worship, in which the peculiar tenets of the Universalists can be proclaimed and vindicated without fear of the arrogant religionists of the day. The house is 27 feet by 50, finished in a plain but neat style, without galleries. It is situated on Herkimer street, in a part of the city rapidly improveing, which will make the location an eligible one.—To the exertion of Stephen Van Schaack and Mr. Murdock is the erection of the house chiefly owing.—We were pleased with the house for we saw no idle expenditure about it, no unnecessary waste of money which, alas! can be said of few churches.

We had the privilege of lecturing in the house on the last Sabbath in October, morning, afternoon and evening, to an audience respectable in numbers and appearance, particularly so in the evening. We were highly gratified with the attention and apparent spirit of enquiry we saw manifested. Every thing, we saw, indicated to us that the day of redemption for Albany has come nigh, and her deliverance from gloomy orthodoxy is at hand.

N. B.—It is requested that those who have published an account of the dimensions of the Universalist house in Albany, would correct their statements by the above, as the accounts published are erroneous.

PHILADELPHIA, September 12.

Mr. Brownson,—Since my arrival in this city I have been favoured by a friend with the Gospel Advocate, No 17, which contains an extract of a letter from New-York, in which Mr. Fisk is highly censured. I had concluded to permit that extract to pass unnoticed—inasmuch as the enmity of certain individuals (thy correspondent among the number) against Mr. F. is somewhat known. But having ascertained that unfavourable and, as I believe, erroneous impressions have been made on many minds respecting the publication of the "Proceedings," &c., I thought proper to submit the following to the public through the Advocate, being persuaded that it will not be refused an assertion.

In the first place—two (being a majority) of the committee of publication, approve of the pamphlet published at the Gospel Herald office. Mr. Fisk obeyed our instructions in regard to the exclusion of certain articles. I wished them rejected, not because they were from the pen of Mr. Kneeland, but for the following reasons:—1. Mr. Bates, author of the Address and Chairman of the committee of correspondence, concurred with me (July 22,) in believing the views of that committee to be, that *nothing but the proceedings antecedent to the 4th*

of July and the Address, should be published. 2. He voluntarily offered to cut out part of the Address in order to get it into SIXTEEN pages. 3. He concurred with me in the propriety of withholding the names of the committee of correspondence from the publick until they obtained some news to communicate, and believed such to be the wish of that committee. 4. He believed the committee of publication to be vested with discretionary powers. These facts are of much importance, inasmuch as they express the opinion of the *Chairman of the Committee*, in regard to their views on the subject. If *some* of the *members* of that commitiee entertained different views, it merely proves the existence of a misunderstanding.

Being in an ill state of health, and intending to leave the city for a few weeks, I desired Mr. Fisk to represent my wishes in the committee of publication. Mr. Bussing did the same. It is absurd to talk of the illegality of this measure—it was merely a matter of accommodation among ourselves. I repeat, Mr. Fisk represented the *wishes* of a majority of the committee of publication.

Secondly. I voluntarily agreed to publish the pamphlet at my own individual risk—and agreed, however, that those who subscribed for a number of copies should have them at the cost of printing. Exclusive of my own subscription for friends who were not present, the number subscribed for did not exceed 350 copies, while the subject was under consideration. I made a calculation for 32 pages, and found that 2000 copies could be printed for about $60. Under an impression that the Address would occupy more space that it actually does, the number of pages proposed was 32. The reasons why this number was not published may be found in the foregoing statement of facts. From that statement and the pamphlet printed at the Herald office, it appears, that if the committee of publication erred at all, it was not in publishing too little, but too much. Mr. Fisk presented a bill to the committee of correspondence, in my name, for printing. Of this I did not approve—because I contemplated publishing the pamphlet at my own individual risk.

And now, Mr. Editor, why all this contention about a pamphlet of 20 pages? Why is not the name of thy correspondent attached to the extract? Does he wish to enjoy the *very enviable* satisfaction of stabbing Mr. Fisk's character with misrepresentation, and remain concealed? "We must purge out the old leaven." True, but is not that leaven in the mind of thy correspondent?

No one more deeply regrets the present contention among liberal christians than myself. Our warfare should be with the common enemy of our liberty and happiness, and not with each other. The exigency of the times demands our united energy. May we ever remember that "united, we stand; divided, we fall." Respectfully, &c.

C. A. THOMAS.

The following are curious statements. We know not their correctness, we give them as we find them. They relate to an article we published respecting the Proceedings of Liberal Christianity in New-York. It is due to both parties that they have a hearing.—ED.

From the Gospel Herald.

MISSTATEMENT CORRECTED.

An extract from an *anonymous* letter, having appeared in a western periodical, implicating the motives and conduct of Mr. Fisk, with regard to the pamphlet published on the fourth of July, we deem it our duty to correct any unfavourable impressions that have been made, by stating the *facts* in the case. Mr. Fisk, so far from "assuming the dictation," &c., *acted according to our directions*. He acted as our agent, merely; and the pamphlet, as published by him, meets our approbation.

THOMAS BUSSING, } *Publishing*
A. C. THOMAS, } *Committee.*

I would merely add, that discretionary powers were vested in the publishing committee, to publish the pamphlet as they thought proper. The article which was rejected by the committee, by which the *vanity* of a certain individual was so deeply wounded, was considered by them as not at all relating to Liberal Christianity. Not only does the pamphlet meet the approbation of the publishing committee, but we think, also, that of eighteen out of the committee of twenty-one. In fact, there are *only three individuals* in the whole city of New-York, who have, (to my knowledge,) expressed the least dissatisfaction.

T. FISK.

The following, from the pen of R. Canfield, the foreman in the office of the Gospel Herald, will correct the corrector of misstatements:

The first paragraph of the above is forged, and false. It was *written* by T. Fisk, and *signed* by him. Whether Mr. Bussing and Mr. Thomas, the latter of whom is now absent, will become accessaries *after the fact*, time must determine. Mr. F. *did assume* the dictation. The committee *wanted* no agent. I was senior and only acting member of the publishing committee. When the pamphlet was printed, Mr. Thomas was absent for the benefit of his health, and Mr. Bussing had already delegated his power to *me*. I was not *consulted* on the subject, and used my efforts to have it correctly published, but was thwarted by the dictum of Mr. Fisk.

On the second paragraph I remark, that no discretionary powers were vested in the publishing committee, so far as regarded their *doings*. This was peremptory. The second sentence is totally false, and the third is in the same predicament. The committee of twenty-

one had nothing to say about it, and that of *nine*, where the order to publish originated, voted it DOWN *unanimously*. Messrs. Thomas and Bussing were absent, nor did either attend the meetings, after the order to publish passed. I can *prove* that Mr. Fisk was lectured by a *fourth* person, the chairman of the committee of nine, and his conduct strongly reprobated, but one day before he wrote these articles.—The *three* to whom he alludes areMessrs.Kneeland, Morrison, and myself.

Here are the naked facts in a condensed form. I omit to notice the machinery used, and the contemptible, clandestine management of Mr. F. Let those who *will* peruse the accompanying certificates, and then doubt my veracity, or impeach my credit, if they *can*.

R. CANFIELD,
One of the Publishing Committee.

New-York, Sept. 24, 1829.

I certify, that I was employed in Mr. Fisk's office, some weeks since, while he was engaged in publishing the Proceedings of the Friends of Liberal Christianity, with an address delivered on the fourth of July last, in a pamphlet; and that part of the said proceedings were left out by order of Mr. Fisk, and contrary to the wish and expostulations of Mr. Canfield; and that Mr. Canfield requested me, at the time, to take notice that he would take no responsibility on himself, for the publishing of the pamphlet, if Mr. Fisk left out that part of the proceedings which he then ordered, and, finally, did leave out.

TH. H. MCKEEN.

New-York, Sept. 23, 1829.

I hereby certify, that the statement in the Gospel Herald, signed Thomas Bussing and A. C. Thomas, respecting Mr. Fisk's not assuming the dictation of the printing the pamphlet, is not true, because I, as secretary of the committee, called at the office of the Herald before it was printed, and prohibited Mr. Fisk from printing it in its present form, because it did not agree with the instructions of the committee of nine, and told him at the same time that the publishing committee had no discretionary powers to print what they pleased; and further, that they could not delegate their powers to him or any one else, not a member of the committee. The committee needed no agent, so long as one of the members was capable and ready to do all that was necessary, without interference or dictation. If Mr. F. did not assume the dictation, for what purpose did he call on the chairman to influence him to agree to leave out the names of the committee of nine?

And I further certify, that the objection to the pamphlet was not owing to the articles being rejected, to which Mr. Fisk alludes, but because the names and doings of the committee of nine were omitted, to gratify the animosity of Mr. Fisk. JOHN MORRISON.

New-York, Sept. 23, 1829.

N. B.—Mr. F. will come to the knowledge that there are more than three individuals in this city who express dissatisfaction with the pamphlet and with his conduct also. J. M.

I hereby certify, that I was present at the interview Mr. Morrison had with Mr. Fisk, and heard Mr. M. prohibit Mr. F. from printing the pamphlet unless it was done agreeably to the views of the committee of nine, not of the publishing committee.

OTIS HARRINGTON.

New-York, Sept. 23, 1829.

MISS FRANCES WRIGHT.

This celebrated lady is now on her way to the west. She favoured the inhabitants as she visited the place, with four lectures. The subject matter of her lectures was interesting and her manner peculiarly fascinating.

We have neither room nor inclination to discuss the merits of Miss Wright's principles, and we have mentioned her name only to express our decided disapprobation of the course pursued by many of the pious people of this village. It were better that they should refute her arguments than to vilify her person. The following is from the editor of the Evangelical Magazine.—*Ed. Gos. Adv.*

MISS WRIGHT.

Our good citizens of this village were last week favoured with a visit and six lectures on knowledge from the celebrated Miss Frances Wright, which elicited alike the frowns and anathemas of self-conceited bigots, and the shouts and congratulations of infidels and opposers of christianity. Being unusually occupied with a multiplicity of avocations, while she was here, we did not do ourselves the pleasure and honour of hearing her lecture. We understand, however, that her lectures were attended by numerous and respectable auditories. Probably most who heard her were induced to go out of curiosity to see and hear this celebrated lecturer, female orator, and founder of the Nashuba Institution. All were pleased with her personal address, and allowed her to possess extraordinary powers of oratory, for a female.

But then, her principles!—alas! her principles! What are they? It is doubted by many whether they differ at all from those of the professed philanthropist and philosopher, and known Atheist, of New Harmony memory, Robert Owen. And then too, her notions of matrimony! Her opposition to the marriage institution, and her maintaining that no law should exist in relation to this, but the law of *kind feeling* &c. All these things rather "stuck in the crops" of many who heard her; although she so managed as to keep her thoughts on

these heads mostly to herself while lecturing here, saying little or nothing about them.—'Tis said she gave some "home thrusts" to the clergy; and it must be granted, that on this subject, and the many absurdities in theory and practice among the professedly Orthodox, she had an ample field in which to display her talents to advantage. We doubt not she said many "good things and true" about the abuses of religion. But then, the question is, whether she is not equally as visionary and absurd in her notions as those upon whose theory and practice she animadverts. Though we doubt not she may do some good, in thus lecturing through the country, in arousing the human mind to inquiry, and exposing errour, absurdity, and abuse, among professed religionists, yet we should most seriously deprecate the general prevalence of her notions on all subjects, political and religious. We think the general prevalence of her principles, with the destruction of all existing institutions, would cast mankind into a dark and tremendous ocean, without compass, or chart, or polar star to guide, without a helm to govern, or any haven in view where the wanderers would find a safe retreat. We think when any one pulls down our house, they ought, in justice, to build us another, equally as good, or better. But her views would completely unhouse the human family, and expose them to the bitter peltings of every storm, and the uncontrolled rage of every cruel tempest. She, however, doubtless has her merits; and we would not detract any thing from them. She has her admirers; and we are willing she should, and that they should be gratified with hearing her: for this is, and we hope ever will be, a free country, tolerating the opinions of all.

ARE UNITARIANS UNIVERSALISTS?

We are disposed to answer this question for the sake of two classes of our readers—those who make the inquiry with honest intentions and an anxious curiosity, and those who in their warfare against Unitarianism, are willing to inflame the prejudices or fears of men with groundless insinuations. It is more than intimated, not only that we are Universalists, but that we are afraid to declare our sentiments. Afraid! afraid of what, or whom? The charge, in itself so ridiculous, is disproved by facts. The pages of the Christian Examiner, the Unitarian Advocate, the Register, and the Liberal Preacher, besides distinct sermons and pamphlets, show its irrelevancy. There is another use made of this topic which, to say the least, is quite as unfair—in the attempt to identify Unitarianism with Universalism in the minds of the uninformed. The connexion between them is just as intimate and necessary as that between orthodoxy and charity. They may exist together and they may not. A Unitarian is one, who believes in the simple unity of God, or if we adopt the familiar use of the term at the present day, he is one who rejects the peculiar dogmas of Calvinism. The Universalist is one, who believes that all men will at some future time and thenceforth forever be happy. This explanation of the words is sufficient to show that they relate to distinct and independent subjects.

Let us however consider the question in its direct form. We shall speak, let it be understood, with no authority delegated or assumed. We write only in our editorial capacity; but as our opportunities of forming a correct judgment have not been slight, we think our conclusions entitled to regard. The Universalists are divided into two sects; who agree in the belief that all men will ultimately be partakers of happiness, but who differ upon the inquiry, whether the commencement of this state of happiness will be contemporary with the entrance of each soul upon a future life. The latter opinion, which denies all punishment after death, is held by the majority of Universalists, to whom it would be well, if the term were restricted, since much of the mistake that prevails has its origin, and much of the misrepresentation which is disseminated, has its excuse, in the two fold use of the name.—The doctrine of limited punishment hereafter, resulted in the final salvation of all men, is embraced by them who are called restorationists, or sometimes restorationers. This class of Universalists is much smaller than the other, which has grown rapidly, and is now increasing faster probably than most other sects in New-England. Injustice has been done by speaking indiscriminately of Unitarians as Universalists; for as most persons have derived their idea of Universalism from the prevailing class, they suppose that Unitarians are charged with a denial of future retribution. We have too much respect for the writers who have thrown out the insinuation, to believe that they meant to assert this. Charity would prevent our believing it, for they must have known its falsehood. But they ought to have considered what they must also have known, that this language would be interpreted by nine-tenths of their readers so as to induce this conclusion.

It is the belief of Unitarians that there will be a judgment and a retribution after death, when 'every one shall receive according to that which he hath done in the body, whether it be good or whether it be evil.' Not only is this the general belief, but so far as our acquaintance extends, it is the belief of every one who calls himself a Unitarian and disclaims the title of Universalist. We do not say that there are not Unitarian Universalists, because the vast majority of those who take this latter name, reject the doctrine of the Trinity. But the question is whether they who choose only to be called Unitarians are 'Universalists in disguise.' And we say they are not; there is

no disguise about them; they are what they profess to be. They are neither Universalists nor Calvinists, Roman Catholics nor Atheists, in disguise; but Christians, who believe that 'as a man soweth' in this life, 'so shall he reap' in the next, shame or glory, peace or anguish. Neither are Unitarians Universalists in the sense in which the term is applied to the class who maintain the doctrine of the final restoration of all men to virtue and happiness.—For this is not the opinion of all, nor do we think, of most Unitarians, in this country.—The difference between them is however distinctly marked by the use which they respectively make of the doctrine. The restorationists regard it as the glory of the gospel, its chief and crowning excellence, and insists upon it frequently in their religious services; whereas Unitarians who hold this opinion do not view it in this light, and esteem other articles of faith far more important, and more adapted to promote the ends of Christian instruction.

We are interrupted, and must defer further remarks, but we have given a reply to the question which we proposed to answer.

INFREQUENCY OF REVIVALS.

A resolve was passed at a recent meeting of the York Conference of Churches, of which the following is the substance;—'That the churches are under solemn obligation to make higher efforts than they have ever yet made to secure a *revival of religion* in our churches.'

The subject of the infrequency of revivals is also considered in an editorial article in the last number of the Boston Recorder.

After stating that the churches generally are at present in a good degree free from those faults which ordinarily grieve away the spirit of God, an anxious enquiry is urged into the cause of this withholding of the spirit.

'Is it not truly a day of darkness and gloom, and should not the general and anxious inquiry be, "Wherefore the Lord contendeth with us?"'

These quotations indicate the conviction that exists among Calvinistick Christians, that there is at present an unusual degree of what is termed 'deadness' or religious insensibility, in their societies. This, it seems, they attribute wholly to the withholding of the influences of the divine spirit. We might expect, indeed, that this cause would be assigned; and yet we cannot regard but with surprize, the inconsistency of our brethren, in representing these excitements as the work of God, when we see so much evidence, not only from their recent history among us, but from the constant plans and efforts adopted for renewing and keeping them alive, that they are of human origin.

And we are equally surprised that these ministers should be so deceived in regard to the cause of the supposed religious indifference of their people. Observant as they are of the signs of the times in other things, and skilled in the knowledge of the passions and weaknesses of mankind--how is it that they so misapprehend the true cause of the late 'infrequency of revivals'? How manifest is it on a moment's reflection, that the public mind, like an overstrained bow, has been excited till it has lost its elasticity, and is incapable of being roused by the *same* methods, or perhaps by *any* methods, to the same extent as formerly.

Whilst we sincerely concur with our brethren in urging the duty of self-examination, we would ask—not in the spirit of fault-finding, but in Christian faithfulness—whether, by overlooking this circumstance, they do not countenance injurious apprehensions of the divine Being, in attributing the state of things they lament, to the withholding of the divine influences, against many apparent reasons for their liberal bestowment?

SUNDAY MAILS.—We sound no false alarm on this subject; and yet it is almost impossible to wake up the people out of their sleep. After all the Orthodox have done to prepare themselves for the attack on Congress during the coming winter, we have not heard that a single measure has been adopted to counteract their efforts. The following resolve was recently passed by the Hancock and Waldo Conference of Orthodox churches in Maine.

Resolved, To recommend to the members of Churches connected with this Conference, and to the friends of morality generally, to renew their memorials to the Congress of the U. S. praying that the laws requiring the transportation of the mail, and the opening of Post offices upon the Sabbath, may be repealed.

But there is something at the threshold of our own doors. We copy the subjoined article from the last No. of the "Yeoman's Gazette," printed at Concord, in Middlesex.

At a meeting of the *Andover Association* in the West Parish in Dracut, this day, October 6, 1829,

Resolved, That it is the sense of this body that it is our immediate duty as ministers and christians, and patriots, to exert our influence to procure a memorial from our respective Parishes and vicinities, to be forwarded to Congress praying that the transportation and opening of the Mails on the Lord's day may be prohibited.

Resolved, also—That all the Brethren in the Ministry, and all who love God and their Country, throughout the country and the commonwealth, be earnestly requested to co-operate with us in thus endeavoring to promote the due observance of the holy Sabbath.

Per Order,
SAMUEL SEWALL, *Scribe*.

This Mr. Sewall we believe is the pastor of the church in Burlington. We would enquire

if his people cannot find him some better employment, than that of intermeddling in the concerns of Congress. We suspect he is too much under other men's influence.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

The indifference manifested by the community generally, to the movements and progress of the American Bible Society, is one of the most remarkable traits in the religious character of the American people. That a people proverbially jealous of their rights, and cautious of bestowing money where emolument is not expected, nor the purposes of charity to be obtained, should foster in their bosoms an institution which annually draws from them immense sums, and which menaces in its operations those very rights which are held so dear, is an anomalous and remarkable instance of indifference. We say that this institution *menaces our civil rights;* and feel confident that we speak advisedly in making the assertion. For whatever tends to diminish the means of honourable competition among the citizens of a free state, does in the ratio of such effect, give exclusive privileges to some at the expense of others. This is already the fact in relation to the operations of the American Bible Society. Under the specious and imposing pretence of publishing Bibles for gratuitous distribution to the poor, it has most effectually and triumphantly monopolized the publication of that invaluable book! Thus turning the absolute charities of the people into a speculation in trade! For it should be known, that the Bibles are seldom ever—*almost never—given*, even to the destitute!

We illustrate the monopolizing character of this institution in the following manner—Suppose a certain bookseller invests $10,000, being the whole amount of capital which he can command, in an edition of the Bible. He depends entirely for the refunding of his money, and the support of his family on the sale of his books. In the mean time, the Bible Society commences operations—fills every bookstore, and establishes depositaries in every town, parish, and village, and sells its Bibles for considerable less than the cost which is incurred by the *individual* publisher—but which the society can well afford, as the capital was *given*.—The consequence is—our bookseller is *ruined* —his Bibles lie on his shelves, the sepulchral monuments of his rights—and his family wants bread!

We do not say this is realized in its full extent: but we can point to an instance, where the Bibles of a public-spirited and enterprising individual remain to gather dust—if not return to it—*unsold:* while the society treasures up its thousands from the sale of the same article —on the same street!

No monopoly can be more complete. Nor is it the result of mere accident—it was foreseen and intended. And the managers of another national institution [the American Sunday School Union] have asserted their determination to pursue the same plan—to publish so many light works, and to sell them at so low a price as "to force out of circulation" all other similar publications. Were an individual to make such an avowal, the publick would frown him into oblivion; and yet the same publick will feed, and caress, and flatter an institution which has already more than half obtained its object.

That the American Bible Society has perverted the publick charity into a *trading speculation*, appears from the following facts. For the year ending the first of May, 1828, it issued 134,629 books—of which number it *sold* 127,347, and *actually gave* about 7200 to the destitute! The amount from sales was $44,603—a respectable sum for giving away 7000 Bibles and Testaments! That, it is believed, was the first instance in which the publick were told that the society *sold Bibles.*

The present year we are favoured with another report of sales, from which it appears that the work goes on with great profit. For the year ending the first of May, 1829, this society has issued 200,122 books—of which it *sold* 191,974, the amount of which was more than $78,688. In the meantime it distributed *gratuitously* 8148 books!—*Evangelical Mag.*

LIKE FOR LIKE.

"Answer a fool according to his folly." Prov. xxvi. 5.

The following article appeared in the Boston Recorder of the 14th inst.

"*A Universalist Confounded.*—A writer in the N. Y. Observer relates the following anecdote of a scholar belonging to an Infant school in that city. 'He was sitting at the table [at home] one day, when an Universalist woman came in, and began to advance her dangerous doctrines; asserting that there was no such thing as a hell, and no punishment after death for the wicked. The little fellow (not more than seven years of age) dropped his knife and fork, and looking at her, said, using the awful language of the word of God; Rev. xxi. 8,—'But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.' He said no more, and I need not add, the woman said no more."

A writer in the Trumpet relates the following anecdote: A child was sitting at the table one day, when a Calvinistick *woman* came in, and began to advance her dangerous doctrines, asserting that all men would not be saved, but that God would cast off a part forever. The little fellow, (not more than 7 years of age) dropped his knife and fork, and looking at her said, using the language of Paul and Jeremiah,

"*God will have* ALL MEN *to be* SAVED," (1 Tim. ii. 4.) and "*The Lord will not cast off forever:* but though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies, for he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." (Jer. iii. 31, 33.) He said no more, and I need not add, the woman said no more.

Query. Is not one of these anecdotes as good as the other?

TRACTS.

"*Try what you will there's nothing like*"—*Tracts.*

In the paucity of Revivals, Tracts must supply their place and sustain the mighty conflict with infidelity and Universalism,—that is, the doctrine of Universal Redemption and Salvation. This doctrine, so terrible to modern orthodoxy, is spreading far and wide, in all directions, teaching man every where that God loves them, and intends their everlasting salvation, that he sent his Son into the world for this very purpose, and that he will assuredly accomplish it, in the utter destruction of sin, death and hell, and the complete triumph of holiness and happiness throughout the entire moral world. In consequence of the spread of this doctrine, and the ameliorating influence which it is every where exerting, the terrours of an angry Deity, a mighty devil, and an endless hell are so weakened, and rendered so ineffective, that it is the hardest work in the world to get up a revival of any magnitude in any place. And unaccountable as it seems to many, the circulation of the Bible in all parts of our country, appears not at all to check the still growing evil,—the dreadful doctrine of impartial and universal grace. What then can be done, with any hope of success? Why fill the world with orthodox Tracts,—send one of these *gospel* messengers, at least once a month into every family. They have already wrought wonders, and are read, by the young especially, in preference to the Bible,—*that* is an old fashioned book, says comparatively little about hell and eternal death, and a great deal about the mercy of God, and of its enduring forever, of his love for the world, for the ungodly, and that all shall know him, that he will have all men to be saved, and that Christ gave himself a ransom for all,—about every knee bowing, every tongue confessing, praising, &c. &c, so that the reader hardly knows what to think of these things, or how to understand them. But Tracts speak out plain, to the heart and conscience, and tell people that they are in danger every moment of dying and dropping into hell, and of being tormented by devils to all eternity; and that God, and the saints in heaven will never more feel any pity or compassion for them, but rejoice in the sentence of their eternal condemnation in the bottomless pit of despair. Such a doctrine as this, which tracts inculcate with so much force at once alarm the minds especially of young people, and almost *compel* them to love God, and delight in serving him, and to hate and despise the wicked. So that, "Try what you will there's nothing like tracts." Of this a writer in the last Observer appears to be deeply sensible. He says, speaking of the monthly distribution of tracts, 'We know of no devoted, intelligent active christian, who has considered the nature of this work, and viewed it in all its bearings, who is not deeply impressed with its magnitude, and the desirableness of its universal adoption. Let the work then go on; let every christian arouse himself to it.—Let him see to it that the guilt of no soul, lost for eternity, be found upon himself." From such ridiculous cant, and ignorant fanaticism 'Good Lord, deliver us."—*Religious Inquirer.*

[From the Kentucky Baptist Recorder.]

"400,000 *Souls in Kentucky destitute of the Gospel.*

The exaggerated and false reports of missionaries, sent to enlighten the western wilds of Kentucky, is almost past credence. The following is a superlative misrepresentation of fact. The writer of such an article, if he be a riding missionary, ought to be recalled. Indeed it is strange, how any *religious* paper in the east, could be so duped as to publish such falsehood for the truth. The churches in the east had much better bestow their charities in the support of widows, than send missionaries to the west. Through the help of God we can take care of ourselves. Indeed, the people have little or no confidence in these graduated missionaries who receive a salary of 400 dollars per annum—ride about the country and do little or no good either to the souls or bodies of their fellow creatures.

"FIELD TO BE OCCUPIED.—Recent communications made to the editor of the Home Missionary informs us that there are in *Kentucky* not far from 600,000 inhabitants, and the whole supply of *Presbyterian* ministers is only about FIFTY; and these, it is said, are *one fourth* of the whole number of ministers of all denominations in the state. It is therefore estimated that *four hundred thousand* souls in Kentucky are *destitute* of the stated administration of the Gospel, while multitudes seldom hear the voice of a Christian minister of any kind!"—*Boston paper.*

MODERN HISTORY OF UNIVERSALISM.

A friend in Albany says: "Subscribers for the History of Universalism have frequently inquired of me to know, when the Modern History will be delivered. I wish you to send me a Letter, and inform me when I shall probably receive it."

In reply we say, the Modern History of Universalism we hope to get out in the coming

month of January. To facilitate the work, we have contracted to have it printed on Treadwell's Power Press; and we have got through 150 pages. We expect it will make from 350 to 500. A copious Index will accompany it, by means of which, with very little trouble, the reader may turn to any subject embraced in it. If there are any who have not returned the subscription papers for this work, they are requested to do so forthwith.—*Trumpet.*

A society of Universalists, consisting of fifty three members was formed in Pultney, Vt. on the 3d ult. Another has just been gathered in Guildford in that State.

After this number of the Advocate was nearly prepared for the press, it was thought advisable to leave out the name of O. A. Brownson as editor. Mr. B. has ceased to be a Universalist preacher, and commenced lecturing in favour of Miss Frances Wright's notions of philosophy and religion. If he does not avow Atheism, he does not profess to be a Theist. He cannot, therefore, consistently advocate the truth of Christianity, the future salvation of all or any of the human family, nor the existence of a God, or of any intelligent power to us invisible. Whether his present course be the result of conviction or of mental aberration, we consider it widely inconsistent with the plan of the Gospel Advocate. He has already apprised the publick that Nature does not teach the existence of a God. The reader must know, if revelation be rejected, what this declaration amounts to, and we therefore omit repeating terms, which might be considered harsh or unfriendly.

The publisher of the Advocate always has believed that Nature taught the existence of a God. When we see the trees of the forest prostrated by the resistless hurricane, we see power without any visible marks of intelligence. But when we see the timbers nicely prepared and fitted so as to form an elegant mansion, we know that the skillful workman has been engaged, and that his intelligence not less than his physical power, was necessary to adjust the different parts of the building. And look at man! He did not form himself; and yet his bones, muscles, nerves, veins, and arteries, are all nicely calculated to answer particular purposes. The same may be seen in the great variety of animals. We further observe that all their members are calculated for their peculiar condition—for defence or flight, and also for procuring subsistence.

Besides, the common sense of mankind in general has ever decided that there is an intelligent power manifested in the order of Nature; and we can see no use in attempting to unsettle this fundamental principle. It is true that this intelligent power is not cognizable by any of our senses, and hence must be excluded from Miss Wright's system of "knowledge." Nor can we see electricity, magnetism and many other things, which are discovered only by their effects on the material universe, and yet the best philosophers have not rejected them as dreams of the imagination.

We regret that we have been compelled to take a course that may be unpleasant to the feelings of Mr. B. We do it however without any unfriendly motives to him or any disposition to engage in controversy with any person whomsoever.

After three more numbers, the Advocate will pass into the hands of Br. Skinner, whose talents, prudence and stability are unquestionable.

U. F. DOUBLEDAY.

UNION OF PAPERS.

NEW ARRANGEMENT.

A weekly paper for One Dollar and Fifty cents.

The EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE, now in progress of the Third Volume at Utica, and GOSPEL ADVOCATE, now in progress of the Seventh Volume at Auburn, will on the 1st of January, 1830, be *united*, and published at Utica, N. Y. under the title of

Evangelical Magazine
AND GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

It has been deemed expedient by all concerned, that these two papers should be united, and hereafter published in one. By this arrangement, subscribers will receive a much larger proportion of matter for the same price, and the interests and harmony of the friends of liberal christianity be greatly promoted. Utica, being the centre of a large and central state in the Union, and embracing every possible facility of communicating with all parts of this state, and with the great bodies of Universalists, East and West, is decidedly the best location for such a paper that could be selected.—As we have the assurance of receiving the aid and contributions of the principal and most talented Universalist writers in the state, as well as the continued aid of former correspondents, we hope by patience, perseverance, and unremitting exertions on our own part, to make this one of the most interesting (as well as cheapest) papers in the connexion; and to sustain for it all the reputation heretofore acquired by the two papers; one of which has been before the publick for about seven years, and the other about three.

The *Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate* will—as heretofore—be devoted principally to the inculcation and defence of Liberal Christianity, or the doctrine of God's impartial and universal grace, and the ultimate holiness and happiness of all his intellectual offspring: To sermons and essays, doctrinal, moral, and practical: To brief expositions and commentaries upon the Scriptures: To religious intelligence, poetic effusions, and miscellaneous matter: And last, but not least—to the determined defence of civil and religious liberty, against the craft of spiritual tyrants, and the wiles of the self-styled "orthodox" clergy, who are—many of them at least—aiming at nothing short of the total extinction of the light which guides

the children of the Reformation, and the entire prostration of our religious liberty, by the union of Church and State, and the establishment of a National Religion.

The modern but popular dogma of *endless misery*, appears to us irrational in the extreme, anti-scriptural, and fraught with the most unhappy and dreadful consequences. We view it as productive of a slavish fear, incompatible with love and cheerful obedience to God, as leading many to despair and a settled melancholy for life, and not unfrequently to still more fatal consequences. Hence, we shall endeavour by candid, fair, logical, and scriptural arguments, to disprove and root out of the minds of community, a doctrine which robs God of his glory, Jesus of his triumph, and man of a rational hope of life and happiness beyond the tomb; and to inculcate instead thereof, the peace-giving doctrine of Christ—that gospel which is "good tidings of great joy unto all people"—and the rational duty of man to "love God *because* he first loved us." We shall, however, always hold ourselves open to conviction, court investigation, avoid personal invective, and cheerfully admit into our columns communications from any, and all denominations of Christians, how much soever they may differ from us in sentiment, provided they are written in a spirit becoming the gospel: for we proscribe no man for his honest belief, but commend him for endeavouring to support it.

That there is an unholy league, a secret plot, entered into by the leading clergy of the "orthodox" party, (we except and exonerate from this charge many who are orthodox in sentiment,) to demolish the fair temple of American liberty, unite Church and State, erect an inquisitorial tribunal, and establish a hierarchy in this hitherto free country, is too plain, even from their own acknowledgements, to need any additional proof. We shall watch their movements with an observing eye, carefully scrutinize their pretensions, and promptly sound the alarm whenever we conceive the safety of our country requires it.

To our former patrons and subscribers, we say—Brethren, we thank you kindly for your friendly aid and support, thus far. We desire, we need, and hope we shall receive, the continuance of your support and countenance in future. Our cause is yet in its infancy in this region of country: but it is gradually progressing. And though we have a host of enemies and prejudices to contend against, yet let us not faint, nor "be weary in well doing; for in due time we shall reap if we faint not." The victory will soon be ours. You have witnessed the progress of liberal Christianity, and enlarged views of the Divine benevolence for a few years past, and many of you can witness that the Magazine and the Advocate have, through your liberality, been in some degree the humble means of speeding the work. Let us go on then—as we believe ours to be the cause of God, of truth, and of humanity—in mutually assisting each other, and doing good to the present and to future generations. Every good subscriber who withdraws his patronage, in some measure discourages our undertaking; and every new and good subscriber added to our list, strengthens our hand and encourages our heart.

All present subscribers, either for the Advocate or the Magazine, will be considered as subscribers for this, unless they give notice to the contrary.

As the *price* of this paper is so very low, it is necessary that all our subscribers be not only *able* but *willing* to *pay for it;* for such alone will enable us to pay our PRINTERS and Paper-Makers. Therefore the utmost punctuality will be expected of subscribers.

CONDITIONS.

The MAGAZINE AND ADVOCATE will be published every Saturday, on fine white paper and good type, on a full sheet medium, in quarto form,—or, on a very large imperial half sheet, which shall contain, by close printing, an equal quantity of matter to a whole medium sheet, and its pages about the same size;—8 pages in each number, 416 in the volume, with a complete Index at the close of the year. The volume will contain just twice as much matter as a volume of the Magazine now does, and at least one third more than the Advocate now does.

PRICE $1 50 *in advance*, or $2 if not paid in advance or within three months from the time the first No. is received. Agents who obtain *eight* subscribers, and become responsible for them, (or companies paying for eight copies,) will be allowed the *ninth copy gratis;* and in the same proportion for a greater number. No subscriptions received for a less time than one year, (unless the money be paid in advance,) and no paper discontinued till all arrearages are paid. Universalist Ministers, and Post Masters friendly to the objects of this publication, are requested to act as agents. All communications to the Editor & Publisher must be *post-paid*, or *free*.

Subscribers' names to be forwarded previous to the first of January, if practicable, or as soon thereafter as convenient, to

DOLPHUS SKINNER, *Utica, N. Y.*

Or if more convenient for the present patrons of the Advocate, names and remittances may be forwarded to *U. F. Doubleday, Auburn.*

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator is published every other Saturday, by* U.F.DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1829. [NO. 24.

THE PREACHER.

'Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

Delivered at the Dedication of the new Universalist Meeting House in Sullivan, N. Y. Oct. 15, 1829.

BY DOLPHUS SKINNER.

TEXT.—For the Lord hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever; here will I dwell; for I have desired it. I will abundantly bless her provision: I will satisfy her poor with bread. I will also clothe her priests with salvation, and her saints shall shout aloud for joy.

Psalms cxxxii. 13, 14, 15, 17.

Man is naturally a religious being. From his natural and moral constitution, he does, and necessarily must, feel his dependence on a Being or cause above himself. He looks around, above, beneath—finds himself placed here, without any act or volition of his own, a dependent and frail creature—seeks to know his origin—asks the cause of his being, and the design of his creation—that he may pay due homage to that Being who gave him existence with all its blessings. And where no revelation has been made, save by the dim light of Nature, where the knowledge of the true God, with all his glorious attributes, does not exist, mankind will worship, they know not what. Man naturally has devotional feelings—he has spiritual wants—he has desires to satisfy—desires that stretch themselves abroad, and grasp at a knowledge of the Eternal. In condescension, therefore, to the dependent condition, the spiritual wants and necessities of his creatures, has God in mercy been pleased to make a revelation of his nature, perfections and will, to man, and to communicate, from time to time, such instruction as his wisdom saw was necessary for his creature to receive. He has also made known to man his duty, as well as privilege, of worshipping his Creator; and on several occasions has shown him what kind of worship is acceptable to him, and pointed out the times, places and circumstances in which it should be offered. This was particularly the case with ancient Israel, his chosen people. "For the Lord hath chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation," &c.

I have selected these words, at this time, believing them peculiarly appropriate, as the foundation of a discourse on the happy occasion upon which we are assembled, viz. that of setting apart, or solemnly dedicating this house to the publick worship of Almighty God. In the developement of the subject embraced in the text, I propose,

I. To show what is meant by the ZION here mentioned:

II. Notice the *provision* of Zion: and

III. The blessings and joys flowing from a participation of Zion's provision.

First. The word Zion literally signifies *a heap* or *monument*. It is applied, 1. To a particular fort in Jerusalem, the strongest and most impregnable in the city. 2. To Jerusalem itself, the city of David, a monument of strength, built to the praise of the God of Israel. Hence the Psalmist says, "Let Mount Zion rejoice, let the daughters of Judah be glad, because of thy judgments. Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generations following. For this God is our God for ever and ever: he will be our guide even unto death." 3. To the holy land, so called, or the land of Judea. 4. To the inhabitants of the city of Jerusalem. And 5. To the whole nation of Israel, as a chosen people unto God, a monument of praise to him throughout the whole earth. "Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem; praise thy God, O Zion. Let Israel rejoice in him that made him; let the children of Zion be joyful in their King."

These, and occasionally several other applications of the word Zion, we find in the Jewish Scriptures. But we, as Christians, are taught to believe that the Scriptures testify of Jesus and his kingdom; and to look through the Mosaick economy, the law covenant, legal rites, and Jewish ceremonies and phraseology, to that more glorious dispensation, the covenant of grace and truth, which came by Jesus Christ. We believe the prophetick delineations in the Old Testament look forward to a "better covenant" than the legal—to a Zion chosen of God, in which more ample provisions are found, provisions not for one nation only, but for a famishing world: Hence God says by the prophet, respecting this covenant with Jesus, "I will place salvation in Zion, for Israel my glory." "It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the end of the earth."

St. Paul, in his epistles, describes, in glowing language, the Zion of the Christian, strikingly contrasting the mild radiance and peaceful glory of the gospel dispensation, with the terror-breathing thunders of Sinai; and the liberty and freedom of the christian, with the bondage endured under the law covenant.

"For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which they that heard, entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more:—but ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God, the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Heb. xii. 18, 19, 22, 23, 24. This "mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," is undoubtedly the same as that seen by the Revelator, Rev. xxi. 2, 3. "And I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God, out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God," &c. But this subject is still more clearly illustrated by St. Paul, in an allegory, Galatians, 3d chap. "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above [mount Zion or the heavenly Jerusalem] is free, which is the mother of us all."

Here then we find a key by which to unlock or lay open our whole subject at once.—The law covenant from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, is represented by Agar, or Hagar, the bond-maid of Abraham, and the children or subjects of this covenant by Ishmael, Hagar's son: The Gospel Covenant, the Heavenly Jerusalem, or Zion, is represented by Sarah, the free woman, the wife of Abraham; and the subjects of the gospel Covenant by Isaac, the son of Sarah. Hence the apostle says, "Jerusalem, which is above is free, which is the mother of us all;" meaning that all, both Jews and Gentiles, were embraced in the gospel covenant, as heirs of freedom and salvation by Christ. "For the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." This gospel promise that was made unto Abraham is recorded in a variety of passages of Scripture. Gen. xii. 2, 3. God says to the patriarch, "And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing, and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall ALL FAMILIES *of the earth be blessed.*" Gen. xviii; 18. and xxii; 18. "Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and ALL THE NATIONS *of the earth* shall be blessed in him." "*And in* THY SEED *shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.*" God renews the same promise to Isaac, Gen. xxvi, 4. "And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of Heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Unto Jacob the same divine promise is renewed, Gen. xxviii; 13, 14, after his vision of the ladder, (which was a type of Christ, the mediator between God and men,) "And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac—in thee and in thy seed shall *all the families* of the earth be blessed." St. Peter makes mention of this promise to the fathers; Acts iii; 25. "Ye are the children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy SEED shall ALL THE KINDREDS of the earth be blessed."

Who this SEED of Abraham was in whom this universal blessing was to be enjoyed, St. Paul informs us, Gal. iii, 16. where he says: "Now to Abraham and his *Seed* were the promises made. He saith not, and to *seeds*, as of many; but as of ONE," *And to thy Seed, which is in Christ.* Thus we see, by this Gospel Covenant that *all nations*, *all families*, and *all kindreds* of the earth, are promised a blessing in Christ. I know there are some men of cavilling and sceptical minds, who are disposed to doubt, or endeavour to evade the force of these promises, by saying that they embrace only *some* of all nations, *some* of all families, and *some* of all kindreds of the earth. But I will here remark, if there be a single individual of the human family on the face of the whole earth, who is not of any nation, who is not of any family, and who is not a kindred of the earth, then that individual *may not* be included in the Gospel covenant, but if no such individual can be found, then *all must* be included as heirs to the promised blessing.

Having seen what the gospel covenant is, and what are the blessings promised in it to the whole human family, let us now institute a comparison, of this covenant, 1st. with that of

the law, and 2d. with one of human origin and human invention.

It has been supposed by some that the law covenant was totally destitute of mercy, and breathed nothing but wrath and condemnation. But we shall see by an examination, that it is not so much the want of mercy, as the want of power, in this covenant, that subjects its children to bondage, and seems to abandon them to death. Let us here turn to the account of Hagar, the bond-maid, and her son Ishmael, whom the apostle represents as typical of the law and its subjects. Gen. Chap. xxi. When it was determined to cast out Hagar and her son from the house of Abraham. "The thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight, because of his son." Here we see the *Father's love*, the father's compassion for his child. Nevertheless, as God commands it, Abraham submits, and the son is cast out. "And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, (putting it on her shoulder,) and the child, and sent her away; and she departed and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba. And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat her down over against him, a good way off, as it were, a bow shot; for she said, Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him, and lifted up her voice and wept." Here we see, (even in Hagar representing the law covenant,) the foudness of a mother's love, the yearnings of maternal compassion—she would fain save, but has not the power, and therefore the cry of the son to her is unavailing. But in this hopeless helpless condition, behold the mercy of God displayed in the gospel covenant. "And God heard the voice of the lad; and the angel of the Lord called to Hagar out of Heaven, and said unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is: Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thy hand, for I will make of him a *great* NATION," &c.—What! is Ishmael to be made a great *nation*? Yes; and of course, as *all nations* are promised a blessing in Christ, he comes in as an heir and sharer of the blessings of the gospel covenant. Here we see, that where the law covenant fails, for want of power, and leaves its subjects helpless and hopeless, the gospel covenant succeeds, and encircles them in the arms of everlasting mercy and salvation. "For what the *law could not do*, in that it was *weak* through the flesh, God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." "For if the first (the law) covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof: for the law made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God."

"For the Lord hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever." The gospel covenant is the covenant of God's choice—the covenant in which he will abide, and dwell with all men, and be their God, and they shall be his people. Ishmael that had been cast out—or the subjects of the law that had not obtained mercy—shall be embraced and find mercy and rest unto their souls, in this new or gospel covenant. "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord: for all shall know me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second."—This second shall never be removed. It is the Lord's rest forever—and all who believe in the promises of the gospel covenant, "do enter into rest." "They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth forever." Let us now,

Secondly, compare this covenant with one of human origin and modern invention. This I would not do at this time, were it not a fact that the covenant of human origin is *ascribed* to God, as if he were its author, and many souls, deluded by the sophistry employed in its defence, cling to it as the true covenant, thereby depriving themselves of all rest, day and night and of the heavenly provisions found in the true and gospel covenant, which the Lord made and not man. This covenant of human origin declares that "by the fall all mankind lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell forever." It further adds, "God having out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a COVENANT *of grace*, to deliver *them* out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer; and hath passed by and foreordained the rest to dishonour and wrath, to be for their sin inflicted, to the praise of the glory of his justice." Or in other words: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death," &c. Now, my friendly hearers, let us look at

this covenant and examine it carefully, to see whether it has any claims to a divine origin, (except the *divines* of the Westminster Assembly.) Let us see how it compares with the covenant of God which he proclaimed to Abraham. That declared that all nations, families, and kindreds of the earth, should be blessed in Christ, the seed of Abraham;—this declares that God hath elected *some* to everlasting life, &c. and foreordained the *rest* to everlasting death, &c. In that we are taught that the wisdom that is from above is *without partiality*, and that *the Lord is good unto all*, and his tender mercies over all his works; in this we are taught the infinite *partiality* and infinite *cruelty* of God—that he is good to a *part only*, and has foreordained *the rest* to infinite and endless wretchedness. These covenants, therefore, cannot both have one origin—of course one is *human*, the other *divine*—one is the wisdom of heaven, the other the wisdom of this world, which is foolishness with God. And, as it is written, "the wise are taken in their own craftiness," this human covenant is not only shown to be a *false* one, by its opposition to the word and covenant of God, but also by its destroying and contradicting itself. Thus, in one part of it we are gravely told that God did from *all eternity* elect *some* to everlasting life, enter into a covenant of grace with them, &c. and in another part of it we are told that *all mankind* are under his wrath and curse, &c. and *liable* to the pains of hell forever! Pray tell me, if *some* were elected to everlasting life, *from all eternity*, how *they* could be *liable* to the pains of hell forever! Just as liable to these pains of hell, as the eternal and irrevocable decrees of Jehovah were to be broken, and no more so!

Hence it must be clear to every rational, reflecting mind, that this is not the covenant, or Zion, that God hath chosen—it is not the covenant in which he will rest—neither is it one in which its own advocates can find *rest to their souls*. They have no rest day nor night. Ask the fond mother who embraces this covenant or creed, while she visits the lowly grave of a recently departed child, and bedews the green turf with her tears, if *she* can find rest and peace to her soul, while she views the probability of her child being in hell as great as that it is in heaven?—Silence seals her lips—and the big tear of anguish steals down her cheek; evincing to the beholder that she is destitute of that rest and that peace that flow from a firm belief in the covenant of God's impartial grace. Brethren let us rejoice that we have been delivered from the influence of so gloomy a covenant as that we have now noticed; and that this covenant, which has no higher authority than human,—which was invented by crafty and designing men, shall finally be made to give way before the all-conquering power of love and light divine, and be succeeded by that covenant of impartial grace which the Lord has chosen, and in which he "will rest forever." He declares by his prophet to the makers of these false covenants, which are so pregnant with death and hell, "your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand."—Let us turn to the covenant of the Lord, the strong hold of Zion, which shall never be removed.

II. We will now notice the *provision* of Zion. 'I will abundantly bless her provision: I will satisfy her poor with bread. I will also clothe her priests with salvation, and her saints shall shout aloud for joy.'

The provision of Zion is rich and abundant, and just such provision as the needy sons of humanity want for their spiritual comfort and satisfaction—just such as a God of infinite mercy saw was necessary for his moral offspring. It is the bread of life with which God will satisfy the poor of Zion. This provision is thus described by the prophet Isaiah, chap. 25, verses 6, 7, 8: "And in this mountain, [mount Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem,] shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees; of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it." Here we have the promise of God that a feast of fat things shall be made in Zion for all people—that is, for just as many as were promised a blessing in Christ by the gospel covenant. But what is this feast of fat things? What is this provision of Zion? Answer. It is the spiritual provision of the gospel,—it is Jesus Christ, our Passover, who was slain for us; who of God, is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption—who says, "I am the bread of life—the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." It is Jesus who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time; who by the grace of God tasted death for every man; who is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." It is the fatted calf that was slain, to prepare the feast for the returning prodigal. It is the marriage feast that was provided, when the king says, "my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come unto the marriage." It is spiritually bread for the hungry, drink for the thirsty clothing for the naked, eyes for the blind, ears for the deaf, tongue for the dumb, feet for the lame, health for the sick, salvation for the lost, and life for the dead. In short, it is every thing that the poor and the needy in Zion can desire; it is what all pray for, and what alone

can satisfy them. Its bounties are ample as the spiritual wants of a perishing world.

"Eternal Wisdom has prepared
A soul reviving feast,
And bids our longing appetites
The rich provision taste.

Dear God! the treasures of thy love
Are everlasting mines,
Deep as our helpless miseries are,
And boundless as our sins.

The happy gates of gospel grace
Stand open night and day:
Lord, we are come to seek supplies,
And drive our wants away."

These are the provisions of God's house, exhaustless stores of immortal love and boundless grace. They can never be exhausted, can never grow less, can never prove insufficient to feed all the poor of Zion. Like the light of yon bright orb of heaven, whose rays emanate in all directions, and which, although he shines with peculiar splendour on the state of New-York, this day, does not withhold his radiant beams from Pennsylvania, Vermont, or other circumjacent states; so with the provisions of the gospel covenant: although *you* may feast ever so largely, there is none the less for *me;* and though *I* partake abundantly and freely of the bread of Zion, it leaves exactly as much for *you*, and for all the family of man. Indeed, the more there are to share this provision, the more rich and abundant does it seem. Like the bread that was blessed by Jesus for the multitude—the more thousands there are to eat, the more fragments there are taken up. And again—like the sun which has been shining from the morning of time to the present day, and whose light and heat are still unexhausted; so the provisions of Zion will still remain, just as rich, just as free, just as full, after ages on ages shall have rolled away, with a ransomed world still feasting on the same. These provisions, and these alone, can satisfy the soul of man; and of course, this alone can be the true bread of life, that bread with which God will satisfy the poor of Zion; and whoever partakes of this bread, and thus tastes and sees that the Lord is gracious, will say, in the language of the disciples, "Lord, evermore give us this bread."

But, my dear hearers, is there not a kind of bread, a sort of provision that is dealt out to mankind at the present day, very different from that of which we are now speaking? There is, my friends; but it is not the bread of life—it is the bread of death, and it can never satisfy the soul of the eater. It is the provision of that covenant of human invention which we took occasion to notice under a former division of this discourse. It is that doctrine which consigns, (by an irrevocable decree of God, passed long before man had a being,) a large portion of the human family to the immortal miseries of a never-ending hell, and represents the Father of all mercies and God of all grace as delighting to torment them with infinite cruelty world without end! This doctrine, the doctrine of *endless misery*, can never satisfy a rational soul; for it is not the bread of God. Its own advocates are very far from being satisfied with it. For if they were satisfied with it, they would not be always employed in praying that it might be otherwise, in beseeching God that it might not prove true. The more firmly any one embraces and believes this doctrine, the more wretched and miserable he is. Like Pharaoh's lean kine, the more he eats of this bread, the poorer he is—he is still ill-favoured and lean—he is unsatisfied and wretched, for it is not the "feast of fat things," of which he eats. We feel to pity, more than blame, those who sincerely believe in this cruel doctrine.—The sad and gloomy countenances they wear bespeak the bitter anguish of their hearts, and show that they are unsatisfied. Indeed, it is impossible it can be otherwise, while they thus believe. Is there, within the sound of my voice, a single soul who believes in this awful doctrine? Let me ask that one, hast thou ever buried a friend? hast thou ever followed to the lonely grave a beloved father? mother? husband? wife? son? daughter? brother? or sister? hast seen the beloved form lowered into the cold and narrow house—heard the grating of the rope around the coffin—and the rattling of the sand on its lid—and said "farewell forever"—and hast then bethought thee, "perhaps that beloved object, dearer than life, is now inwrapt in the flames of a never ending hell, to shriek in hopeless despair, and be the sport of demons world without end?" If so, O, I pity thee, poor soul; thy heart is strung with the keenest anguish—thy soul finds no rest, and thou art a stranger to the consolations of the gospel of Christ. And if this doctrine be true, can any of you be sure that yourselves and all your dear kindred will escape so awful a doom? If it is the portion that God has assigned to any of his children, what reason have you to believe that you and all your friends will escape?—None.

But, my dear hearers, this doctrine cannot be of God, for the very reason that it cannot satisfy those who embrace it: for the doctrine of God satisfies—"*I will satisfy her poor with bread*," &c. And God calls on mankind by the prophet, to reject and abandon what will not satisfy: "Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread, and your labour for that which satisfieth *not*? Hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is *good*, and let your soul *delight itself in fatness*." Salvation is the desire of every soul of Adam's race—yea, the salvation of all is what is prayed for by every one who has tasted of the rich provision of Zion. I know we are sometimes told that "the doctrine of universal salvation is a very *pleasing* doctrine–*peculiarly pleasing to the carnal mind*." But although we admit it is a

pleasing doctrine, yet it is to the *spiritual mind*, the *heavenly*, instead of the carnal man, that it is the most pleasing. And here I will appeal to every sincere christian, to every spiritually minded person, and ask, Is it not the earnest prayer of your heart—is it not what your soul fervently desires, that not only yourself, your family and friends, but every individual of the human family may be saved from sin, made to share the rich inheritance of gospel grace, and feast on the heavenly provision of Zion, of which you now are made partakers? All will answer, "yes." Well, then, if this is what you desire—if this is what you fervently pray for, would it not be peculiarly pleasing and satisfactory to be assured that these prayers shall be answered, and these benevolent and heavenly desires gratified? Most certainly; for "there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." And that joy never can be full till the last son or daughter of Adam is brought in.—We see, then, that the doctrine is a pleasing doctrine, to every benevolent and spiritual mind; it is what every true christian prays for, and what alone can satisfy the soul. God says, "I will satisfy the poor of Zion with bread;" and calls on all to eat that which is good, and let their souls delight themselves in the feast of fat things which is made unto all people. We will now briefly notice,

III. The blessings and joys flowing from a participation of Zion's provision. "I will also clothe her priests with salvation, and her saints shall shout aloud for joy."

The priests of Zion, or if you please, the ministers of the gospel covenant, who embrace the promises which God made unto Abraham, that all nations, families and kindreds of the earth should be blessed in Christ, are clothed with salvation, armed with the panoply of heaven, the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God, and go forth proclaiming salvation to the ends of the earth. Of them it is truly said, "How beautiful upon the mountains, are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that *publisheth salvation;* that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth. Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing: for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." Such are the blessings flowing from a participation of Zion's provisions, that her priests are clothed with salvation—not with the gloomy frowns of wrath and the terrors of damnation—but with the garments of righteousness and the helmet of salvation; and when, in the language of the angel to the shepherds, they proclaim, "Fear not, for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people," the saints of Zion "shout aloud for joy." There are no despairing, gloomy souls among her guests—none driven to insanity through a fear of hell—none from whom the radient beams of divine mercy are withdrawn—all rejoice in the boundless love of God, and feast on the rich provision of his house. To use the language of the inspired apostle, they "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory; receiving the end of their faith, even the salvation of their souls; and being glad with an exceeding joy." Well may the saints of Zion shout aloud for joy, inasmuch as they are fully persuaded that "neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord;" and can look forward with the full assurance of faith, resting in the promises of God, to that happy time when "the ransomed of the Lord (who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time) shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; when they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." They see in prospect before them, the consummation of that glorious era prophetically described by the Revelator, when "every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them," shall sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, "shouting aloud for joy, and saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."

Brethren and sisters of this society, who have built this house for the worship of God, and are now assembled to dedicate it to his service, to unite in his worship and praise, and pay your vows to the Most High—may you richly share these blessings of Zion—may these joys be yours. Here may the doctrine of the divine covenant be proclaimed, and drop as the rain and distil as the dew; as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers of rain upon the mown grass, to revive the spirits of the contrite ones. Here may your prayers ascend as sweet memorials before the throne of grace, and be answered in showers of mercies and blessings on your heads. Here may the hoary head of the aged bend in humble devotion and grateful acknowledgement of the manifold favours of God, and worship, leaning on the staff of his divine promises. Here may the middle-aged often resort, and delight to pay their vows to Jehovah, and triumph in the God of your salvation. Here may the youth and rising generation, often as the sacred Sabbath, with its pure and holy joys returns, meet to hear the sacred gospel's gladdening voice, and be trained to virtue and piety, being taught to remember their Creator in the days of their youth.—

Here may the stranger that sojourns with you, turn his weary, wandering feet, come to Zion's feast, and eat of the bread of life. Long may this temple stand as a monument and witness of your devotion to the Redeemer's cause, that you, and your families, and kindred, and friends, may visit Zion's hill, your feet stand in her gates, and your souls be fed with her provision. And when your eyes are closed, and your voice is hushed in death, may your immortal spirits, with a ransomed world redeemed from death, forever bask in the sunshine of Jehovah's glory, feast on the smiles of his love, rest in his paternal embraces, and speak his praise in tears of joy and everlasting gratitude. AMEN AND AMEN.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

UNIVERSALIST HYMN BOOK.

Mr. Doubleday:—When at Boston I had an opportunity of examining, a new Hymn Book by the Rev. Messrs. Streeter's, Sebastian and Russell well known to the Universalist publick.

The mechanical execution of the book is good. It contains I think five hundred hymns, and a better selection of hymns, whether it respects the poetry or elevated sentiment I presume cannot be made in the English language.

There was one thing that struck me as a real advantage, and those who have acted as clergymen can appreciate it. It is in the arrangement. All the hymns on a particular subject or more properly all the hymns having the same general character are arranged under appropriate heads, consequently the minister, if he knows on what subject he wishes a hymn, need look only under that general head for a suitable hymn.

Another thing which pleased me was I found no hymn I should be ashamed, as a universalist or a moderate religionist of any denomination, to read to a congregation. This can be said of few others. Watts has some good hymns and some and these not a few, but idle nonsense. Pickering's hymns and psalms possess no variety and are too antiquated in sentiment, for the universalists. That is—the views of Christ, of the incarnation and of the atonement (things which I do not understand) exhibited by Pickering's hymn book are such as universalists do not generally embrace. The same may be said of Ballou's and Towner's.

I assured the proprietors I would do what I could to introduce them into universalist societies. As I am no longer a Universalist, it is not probable I shall take it upon me to supply universalist societies with hymn books, but feeling myself bound in honour to discharge my promise and still feeling a deep interest in the welfare of a class of people to whom I have been some years warmly attached, I wish you to allow me through your paper to recommend Messrs. Streeter's Hymn Book, as the one most befitting the principles and feelings of a devotional universalist of any with which I have become acquainted. And as some Book of the kind is desirable I think the societies could not suit themselves better than by procuring it.

Yours, &c. O. A. BROWNSON.

P. S. I recommended to the publishers Marsh & Capen, to send you on a quantity. I know not whether they have arrived or not.

[The Publisher has received them, and they are now for sale.]

ANCIENT HISTORY OF UNIVERSALISM.

Mr. Doubleday:—I wish to enquire if the Ancient History of Universalism, by Hosea Ballou, 2nd. of Roxbury, Mass, meets a ready sale. I believe you have them for sale. The work is an admirable one. I know of no History except Gibbon's "decline and fall" in the English language that has higher claims on the publick as a literary performance than this. It is almost inimitably candid, as so far as accuracy on the subject of which it treats is attainable, it is worthy of confidence. I think, sir, my opinion is worth something on this point, I have no sectarian prejudices, and it is to me no matter of enquiry whether Universalism or Calvinism be the Orthodox reading. It is not then because the result of Mr. Ballou's enquiries have been in favour of Universalism, that I like the book, but because it is the best history we have or probably can have of what were the opinions of the ancient father's of the church. It also contains much which must interest not only the Christian but the Philosopher.

ON THE NEW-BIRTH.

The good people, of the present day, are all very anxious to know whether a man has "got religion"—"met with a change," or "been born again." And they seem to take it for granted that there is much mystery implied in the above named terms—so much that they themselves know not how to answer them, otherwise, than by acknowledging the whole a mystery. Now I am not very fond of mystery. I want things plain, and easy to be understood. If I am told of a new-birth, I want it conveyed to my mind in such a manner as to appear reasonable. For, whatever is unreasonable and absurd, I cannot believe. I am sensible I cannot know all things, and acknowledge with Young, that in one sense "we nothing know but what is marvellous."—Yet, in another, "what is marvellous we can't believe."

Mankind have, for ages past, received, from their religious instructors many mysteries, unintelligibilities, and awful absurdities.

The benevolent Jesus of Nazareth taught many important truths, among which, was a future state of existence and happiness in that state. A belief in this may increase our hap-

piness here; and it certainly cannot affect our state hereafter. Had man never believed any thing respecting a future world, but what our Saviour taught, the doctrine of the new-birth would have been universally understood at the present day. But the priests, kind creatures, are very fond of mystery; and well they may be, so long as they obtain an abundance of the good things of this world, in explaining mysteries by acknowledging every doctrine they teach to be mysterious.

I believe a man to be religious, or in other words, "has got religion," when he ceases to do evil and learns to do well—when he deals justly, loves mercy, and walks humbly with his God. This is that religion of which St. James speaks, that is "pure and undefiled before God and the Father." He who has this religion will "visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and keep himself unspotted from the world."

The phrases, "got religion"—"been born again," mean one and the same thing. The new-birth is a doctrine taught in the New Testament. And it is a reasonable doctrine. If it were not, I should reject it. It has been called a mystery. And, "what most surprises in the sacred page," man hugs the closest. But he ought to know that "faith is not reason's labour, but repose." That is, in the common use of the term.

I appeal to the sacred Oracle, that oracle will put all doubts to flight. If any one speak not according to the law and the testimony, it is because there is no light in him. What do we find then respecting the new-birth? John says, "we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." Who are our brethren? All mankind. Man, whereever beheld, is our brother. Have we the evidence within ourselves that we love mankind? If we have, "we have passed from death unto life"—been born again. An important change too, and well may it be denominated "the new birth." An apostle says, "let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God."—"Every one that doeth righteousness is born of him." "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world," i. e. overcometh evil and ceases to practice it. Would to heaven, all men were thus born of God, if they were, the world would be happy. Men would cease to worry and devour each other; and the world would become the paradise of God.

The preceding passages teach, if the heart is filled with love, that heart is born again, for love is the fulfilling of the law. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And again "except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven"—which kingdom Christ set up on the earth, and it consists in love, joy, peace, goodness, gentleness, meekness, and temperance,

According to my view, there is no mystery in being born again. When man is convinced that,

"No smiles of fortune ever blessed the bad,
Nor can her frowns rob Innocence of joys;"

then will he be happy. Then will all evil propensities be destroyed in the human heart. Blessed time; enough to animate the hearts of Christians, Philanthropists, and Scepticks, in the glorious cause of emancipating the human race from the thraldom of sin, misery, and woe. But enough.

"Pleasure, we" all "agree, is man's chief good;
Our only contest, what deserves the name.
Give pleasure's name to naught but what has passed
The authentick seal of Reason and defies
The tooth of time; when pass'd, a pleasure still
Dearer on trial, lovelier for its age,
And doubly to be prized, as it promotes
Our future, while it forms our present joy." *Young.*

J. WRIGHT.

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

It is probable that most of the readers of the Advocate are unacquainted with the fact, that the publisher, is also the editor of a common newspaper, the Cayuga Patriot. In that paper he has been engaged in some discussion respecting Miss Frances Wright, and trusts the articles will not be uninteresting to the readers of the Advocate.

FROM THE CAYUGA PATRIOT.

We have received the following from one of the friends of Miss Frances Wright, and although we do not admit that every person has a right to say what he pleases in our columns, we have concluded to insert the article, with such suggestions of our own as naturally arise out of the subject.

(COMMUNICATION.)

Mr. Editor: As you have made some remarks on Miss Frances Wright's views of things, you will oblige me by allowing me to state her views more fully than you have done, and I wish to do this the rather because I have heard much misrepresentation respecting her and her sentiments.

Miss Wright's avowed object is the improvement of the condition of mankind or the promotion of human happiness. This object she proposes to effect by the general diffusion of just knowledge among all classes and equally among both sexes, confident that when the people are properly enlightened they will adopt the best measures for promoting their happiness.

She is not as some would seem to imagine, travelling through the country lecturing against matrimony. Nor indeed is she as she is represented desirous of abolishing that institution, she only wishes so to correct its abuses and its errours that it shall be the friend and not the scourge of human felicity.

Her views on the subject are very simple and I will add very just. They are simply that the object of the marriage contract is mutual

happiness, which happiness can be found only in mutual affection, not in being compelled to live together when the parties as is too often the case in mutual hatred. Law cannot win affection, without affection the parties cannot be happy, without happiness the object of matrimony is not answered. In such a case as this what shall be done? Frances Wright says that the organization of society should be such that the parties may separate without injury to themselves or their children. For, she thinks such separation preferable to living together in mutual disgust and continual heart burnings. Whether her views on this subject would "uproot society" any further than necessary to "uproot" its evils I shall not assume the province of determining. For myself I feel no *alarm* on this subject and am willing the subject should be fairly discussed.

On religion she has the sentiments which every enlightened observer of nature who is not aware that he has *more* than five senses to admit knowledge must have. She assumes not to believe nor to disbelieve ought that is said of worlds or beings which are not cognizable by the powers of the human mind. She acknowledges her ignorance of all things which cannot be known and aims to teach only what she herself knows.

She tells her hearers and her readers that there are some things which we can know, and that our minds are occupied about much which we cannot know. It is wisdom she thinks to study only that which can be known, for all the time devoted to enquiries where there is nothing to be known must be fruitless—may give rise to useless, to pernicious, opinionative disputes.

Her immediate object in her lectures through the country is to awaken the people to the subject of a system of education which shall be equal in its effects and tend to instil into the young minds habits of industry, give to the children just knowledge and elevated moral feelings, which may enable the world to unite in the bonds of fraternal affection devoid of strife or discord. My acquaintance with Miss Wright has enabled me to give her views, I believe, correctly. Yours, &c. O. A. B.

REMARKS.

"Miss Wright's avowed object is the improvement of the condition of mankind, or the promotion of human happiness." This has been the *avowed* object of all who have attempted to make a figure in the world; of a Cataline not less than a Solon and a Lycurgus. Hence we let it pass as mere profession.

She wishes the diffusion of knowledge "equally among both sexes." We are not the advocates of female ignorance. It is evident however that nature has designed the sexes for different pursuits, and different duties, and it is therefore proper that there should be some difference in their education. The man may be well educated without a knowledge of needlework and embroidery; and the woman without knowing any thing of the sword exercise and military tacticks.

We are told that she is not desirous of abolishing the institution of marriage. We are acquainted with her writings, and must contradict the above assertion. She disapproves of any institution, any law, or any ceremony, relating to marriage. She would leave the parties solely to the influence of "kind feelings" with liberty to separate when *either* became tired of the connection. Her system would leave the doating wife and tender mother to be deserted, broken-hearted, by the capricious husband, drawn away from his faded wife, by more enticing objects. And what authority has *she* to teach in this matter? What does she know of the feelings of the virtuous wife deserted by the sole object of her affections? Certainly no more than the blind man does of colours. Besides, we deny that the sole object of marriage is the happiness of the parties. The well being of their offspring, and of society in general, is not less to be considered.

But she has a remedy, by which parents may separate without injury to the children. What is it? Why, a community of goods, and the abolition of separate families. Now we say that the bonds of family connexion produce a vast amount of pure happiness, and furnish one of the most powerful restraints on the conduct of individual members of society. When men wander far from home, kindred and friends, experience teaches how prone they are to become robbers, pirates, and vagabonds.

On the subject of religion, we are told, that we have "no more than *five senses* to admit knowledge," and that Miss Wright neither believes or disbelieves "ought that is said of worlds or beings which are not cognizable by the powers of the *human mind*." Here is a studied ambiguity of expression. The great Authour of nature is not cognizable by any of our five senses, and is of course excluded from Miss Wright's system of "knowledge," but the human mind can take cognizance of *power* and *intelligence*, and by means of our five senses, we discover the marks of power and intelligence in the works of nature.

Her immediate object is an improved system of education. And what need have we of education? The merest idiot, can exercise his "five senses;" and if children are taught to reason and draw inferences from facts, they *may* conclude there is a God, and thus get out of Miss Wright's system of "knowledge."

We admit there are some things we can know, and some things we cannot know; but we insist that we *can* know, with sufficient certainty for all practical purposes, not only what is admitted immediately through the senses but every conclusion of the *mind* drawn from facts, by fair logical reasoning.

This will probably close all discussion of Miss Wright's theories in the columns of the Patriot. Whatever notions some may entertain respecting the freedom of the press, we shall continue to take the liberty, as we ever have done, of furnishing our readers with just such matter as we consider interesting to them, and useful to the publick.

SELECTIONS.

From the N. Y. Gospel Herald.

LETTER

From Rev. Hosea Ballou, to Rev. Dr. Beecher, of Boston, on the Licentious Tendency of Universalism.

Sir—I addressed you some time ago, on the subject of "a Mighty Fallen Spirit," of which you said not a little, in one of your sermons. In that address I endeavoured to point out some of your egregious errours; and I had some hope, though I confess it was but small, that you would profit by my attempt, though it was but a feeble one. In my humble opinion, it was your duty to defend the sentiments on which I then animadverted, if you were of opinion that they were either capable or worthy of defence; but what you think of them I know not, nor do I perceive any way by which I can ascertain.

I have still a mind to do you good, without the smallest expectation of receiving any thanks from you. Being informed that you recently gave out publick notice that you were going to prove, in a lecture, the immoral tendency of Universalism, and having also been certified that you made the attempt on the evening of the 4th Sabbath inst. but utterly failed in making out any thing on the subject, more than your bare assertions, accompanied with numerous gross sophisms, I thought it my duty to suggest some method by which you may better succeed in such an undertaking. There is nothing which makes a publick preacher appear to greater disadvantage than to promise a piece of work beforehand, and when the time comes to fulfil the promise, then to go to work without understanding his subject, and without any proper method of executing the undertaking.

1st. Then, let us distinctly understand what is to be proved. It is this: immorality proceeds from a belief that all mankind, will eventually be made holy, happy beings, through the mediation of the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world. Having this statement perfectly distinct in your own mind, make it equally plain to the understanding of your hearers. This faithfully done, you must next proceed to demonstrate that the germ of immorality is necessarily wrapped up in this faith, and naturally grows from this hope. To do this to the understanding of your hearers, you can take an individnal for example. And as it is to be expected that a man knows as much about himself as he does about any other person, you may speak in the first person singular; and if it sound a little like egotism, no matter; the subject is of importance, and the object of infinite concern. Stand up then boldly and address your congregation thus:—My fellow travellers to eternity, I assure you that I believe, without a doubt, that when my mortal pilgrimage on earth is ended, I shall be with Jesus, the Saviour of sinners, that I shall be holy as he is holy, and happy as he is happy; and I also know, for positive certainty, this belief and this hope work in my soul the work of sin, and bring forth in my actions the vilest abominations which ever violated the divine law, dishonoured God, or degraded human nature.

You will easily perceive sir, that less than this amounts to nothing. You certainly cannot *know* the fruits of a belief that you never possessed; and you can easily see also, that if a firm belief in your own salvation will not produce those evil affects, the belief that others will be saved, could have no such effect on you.

Having pointed out one method of substantiating the fact that universalism tends to all manner of immorality, it may be proper to furnish you with another. It is said that in your late discourse on this subject, you quoted no proof from scripture. This, sir, is a great pity. How happened it that you did not quote the first transgression of man, as recorded in Genesis, and show your hearers that the sole reason why Adam transgressed, was his faith in Jesus as his Saviour? And why did you neglect to demonstrate that the whole difficulty which incited Cain to murder his brother, was his firm belief that both he and his brother were embraced in the ever blessed covenant of salvation? Had you shown these things, you would not have been laughed at for your puny, puerile assertions, unaccompanied with the least shadow of proof. No, indeed, but your convinced auditors would have been weighed down with an awful solemnity, and a deep conviction of the danger of believing in the doctrine of salvation; and would have fled for safety to the doctrine, the moralizing doctrine, of everlasting sin and eternal condemnation! And by this time, my dear doctor, you might have elevated your voice, and even commanded fire from heaven to vindicate your reasoning, showing that the sin of Sodom and the cities of the plain, was all owing to Universalism, and when you had set forth the fiery vengeance that fell on that abominable people for their faith in salvation from sin, you might have said that you had got before your story, and, by way of a parenthesis, given your hearers to understand that no other sin was the occasion of the drowning of the world.

How can you account, sir, for your neglect, on this all important occasion, to instance the

horrid murder of the Lord of Life and Glory, by the abominable High Priest of the Jews and the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees, with the whole estate of the elders of the nation?—Do you not know that it was this immoral doctrine of universal salvation that so enraged that wicked people against the Son of God? If they had not been fully persuaded that he was the Saviour of all men, what in all the world could have so incensed them against him? Sir, it is astonishing that you should neglect such palpable proofs, recorded in the scriptures, and stand up in your desk pronouncing a long string of empty assertions, until you and your hearers were weary; and after all, they were not convinced.

Doctor, you had better make another appointment for the purpose of convincing the good, but ignorant people of this city, that immorality was never known in the world until the doctrine of universal salvation was set up and believed. And before you again attempt this necessary work, a labour so much needed, make yourself perfectly acquainted with this method which I have recommended. Begin your task at the right end, and go on regularly; be careful that you do not forget to add the weight of history to your conclusive arguments. Show your hearers that all the abominable persecutions which have deluged the world in blood, were all set on foot and carried on by universalists. Quote history, and prove that Nero was a believer in the final salvation of all mankind, by Jesus Christ; and that it was this belief which caused him to set fire to the city of Rome, and lay the crime to the Christians. Show, moreover that the whole of the ten persecutions which preceded the reign of Constantine, in which many millions of professed christians lost their lives, were all carried on by universalists. But do not stop here; go on and demonstrate your subject by showing that all the persecutions practised by christians against christians, were entirely owing to a belief that finally all mankind will be made holy and happy. Give your hearers, sir, to know that the Roman Inquisition is, and always has been, an engine of universalism; and after you make them understand that more than fifty millions of protestants have been put to death by those abominable believers in universal salvation, go on and prove from history, that all the persecutions which have been carried on by protestants, were owing to their belief that God is good and gracious to all mankind, and will finally make all holy and happy. I beg you would not forget that those who hung the Quakers in Salem, were universalists.—make this truth known to your hearers, and assure them that the very spirit of universal grace is the spirit of persecution. Show them, also, that all the crimes which have been committed in our country, and for which many have been executed, were all committed by universalists; and that there is not now a criminal in confinement, who is not a believer in this demoralizing doctrine.

Sir, you must not think your work is done until you prove, on the other hand, that the spirit of everlasting condemnation and eternal punishment, is the meek and humble spirit of Jesus; that it is the spirit of charity, which suffereth long and is kind; that such as believe in endless punishment are so tender hearted that they would rather suffer death, in the most cruel manner, than to persecute others. I beg you not to forget to state the fact, that John Calvin would never have put Dr. Servetus to death, in so cruel a manner, had not Calvin been a universalist.

When you shall have made all these things evident, your undertaking will be accomplished; and you will hear the welcome sentence, well done, good and faithful servant.

Yours, &c. HOSEA BALLOU.

From the Christian Intelligencer.

SHORT SERMON.

"*Where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched.*"—Mark ix. 44.

These words are thought by many to represent the never ending miseries which await a large portion of mankind in another world.

But in order to understand what Jesus intended in the use of them it is important to consider the following things.

1. Who did Jesus address? From the connexion it appears evident that Jesus spake to John his beloved, and his other disciples.—Could Jesus suppose them exposed to never ending misery? Those who suppose that Jesus referred to another world, do not suppose that believers or true christians are exposed to such a doom. But Jesus warned his dear disciples of real dangers. Hence it would be natural to conclude that Jesus warned them to escape evils in this world.

2. What did Jesus mean by the worm and fire? Jesus would most naturally use language with which his disciples were best acquainted when speaking upon important subjects. He had taught them to search the Scriptures. The Old Testament contained all the scriptures at that time; the New not having been written. In searching the Scriptures to find the meaning of Christ, when he speaks of a worm and fire, we meet with the following. Isaiah lxvi: 24. "They shall go forth and look upon the carcases of them that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." By attending to the connexion it appears plain that the prophet was describing events of time. It was from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, that all were to come to Jerusalem to worship, and to go forth and look upon the carcases, &c. In immediate connexion we have account of new heavens and new earth,

which God should create, which are generally understood to mean the gospel kingdom. Now when Jesus uses similar language with the prophet, why should we not understand him to mean the same the prophet did? If the prophet described things of this world, why should Jesus describe things of another world when he makes use of the same words?

Mr. Parkhurst says, "Our Lord seems to allude to the worms which continually preyed on the dead carcasses that were cast out unto the valley of Hinnom, and to the *perpetual* fire there kept up to consume them."

Here then is a place where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. This valley of Hinnom is made an emblem of the miseries which were coming on the unbelieving Jews. So Jeremiah seems to teach, vii: 20. "Thus saith the Lord God, behold mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruits of the ground: and it *shall burn, and shall not be quenched.*"

Again, 17 "I will kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it *shall not be quenched.*"

Those who would not part with what was dear as a hand or foot for Christ's sake, would be exposed to the tremendous judgments which were soon to come upon Jerusalem. The rejecters of Jesus were serpents and a generation of vipers, who could not escape the damnation of hell. They must be cast into a furnace of fire, where there should be wailing and gnashing of teeth. This furnace was in Jerusalem. So the prophets expressly teach us. Hence those who apply such passages as our text to another state of existence, evidently misapply them. There is a worm of a guilty conscience now, and a fire that burns constantly in the hearts of the ungodly. Their evil passions torment them.

The gospel was designed to save sinners from sin, not from endless misery. That is not mentioned.

When the apostles preached the gospel, they said nothing about unquenchable fire in another world. Jesus was warning his disciples in our text of judgments coming upon the Jewish nation in this world.

The apostles never express sorrow that so many of mankind were in the road to endless ruin. Nor joy, when any souls were converted, that they were saved from an endless hell.

The apostles were grieved to see people live in sin and idolatry.

Christ had compassion on the multitude who lacked bread. He wept over Jerusalem in view of the temporal judgments which were coming upon them. But Jesus never expressed any anxiety for immortal souls exposed to endless misery. If Christ and his apostles believed as limitarians now do, would they have neglected to speak as they do?

Annanias and Saphira were struck dead for lying. If Peter had believed that they went to misery in another world, would he not have intimated as much? Would not Jesus have said as much to his enemies and crucifiers, if he had believed it? But on the contrary he prayed for them, Father forgive them for they know not what they do.

[From the New-York Courier and Enquirer.]

SUNDAY MAILS.—Yesterday we called the attention of the publick generally to the fact that the subject of Sunday Mails was to be renewed at the next session of Congress. The following are extracts from eastern papers, to the same purpose:—

[From the Salem Observer.]

Sunday Mails.—We regret to find another excitement commencing in relation to the Sunday mails. A conference of the clergy has been held at Saco Me. on this subject, and a committee was appointed to memorialize Congress against the transportation of mails on the Sabbath.

[From the New-England Weekly Review.]

Sunday Mails.—It is said that the effort to stop the running of the mails on the Sabbath is to be renewed at Washington next winter.—We sincerely hope it will prove abortive. We have not the least idea that those gentlemen who are bent on carrying the measure into operation, have any design of subverting the religious liberty of the Republick; but we fear that they are the dupes of their own amiable enthusiasm.

The publick want their letters on the Sabbath as well as on other days. If the government has important intelligence in its possession on the first day of the week, that intelligence ought to be communicated as soon as possible to the persons interested. The government should be considered, in this matter, precisely as an individual. If any individual receives on the Sabbath a letter which he thinks it important that his neighbour should read immediately, he does not hesitate to send it, notwithstanding the sanctity of the day. Why should not government do the same thing? Every Sabbath the government has the charge of letters, of almost incalculable importance to thousands and thousands of the citizens of the United States, and why should these letters be stopped?

A great deal is said about the disturbance created by a mail stage passing through the country on the Sabbath day. Nonsense. If the officers of government see fit to stop the mail carriages on the Sabbath, let them at the same time stop all other carriages. This, the clamourers against Sunday mails would hardly like. Rather than go to meeting on foot, they would be reconciled to bear the clattering of a mail carriage on the Sabbath, every hour of the four and twenty. It is a little strange, that a

man should be willing to disturb his neighbours, with the noise of the wheels, merely for the sake of going to church in a handsome style, and yet look with horrour upon a mail carriage, passing through the country to relieve the anxiety and administer to the interests of tens of thousands. And which of these gentlemen that make such an outcry against Sunday mails, would not "loose his ox or his ass on a Sabbath, and lead him away to watering."

We do not wish to expose ourselves to the prejudices of the religious community, for we know that these prejudices cannot fall upon an individual without grinding him to powder. Let the enemies of Sunday mails be charitable toward us, and we will be charitable towards them. If they will give us credit for not designing to subvert the Church, we will continue to give them credit for not wishing to subvert the state.

SABBATH MAILS.—The late meeting of the Orthodox Conferences of Churches of Washington county, of which Gen. John Balkham was Moderator, and Mr. Dennis Garland, Secretary, passed the following:

Resolved, That this Conference also concur with the General Conference, in the following resolution, viz :—"That it be recommended to all connected with this body, to renew their memorials to the Congress of the United States, at its next session, praying for the suspension of the transportation of the Mail on the Lord's day."

This is but the echo of the General Order from Head Quarters. It is certain, that the orthodox throughout New-England, and generally throughout the United States, have agreed to re-petition Congress on this subject with a view to "enter the wedge," and thus prepare for controlling the civil government of the nation. It seems to us that the enemies of sectarian interference, in all directions, ought forthwith to get up remonstrances on the subject and forward them to Congress by their Representatives.—*Trumpet.*

[From the Trumpet and Magazine.]

A MIRACLE.

It is a mistaken notion altogether, that the age of miracles is past. They occur almost every day in cornfields, potatoe lots, cabbage yards, &c. to prove what the inspired writers who wrote the bible forgot to prove, that Calvinistick orthodoxy is true. The *Boston Recorder* of the 21st of October serves up a fresh miracle of corn and potatoes. It runs in this wise. Not long since—the Editor cannot say when;—in one of our interior towns—he cannot tell where; some missionary folks undertook to raise missionary corn and potatoes. They applied to a man for twelve acres of land to plant; but the man would not give the use of it without something as an equivalent. This was enough to blast all his crops. The missionary friends, however, succeeded in getting a little more than an acre of land of somebody else. But we will give the miracle in the words of the Recorder.

"They procured a small piece of land adjoining—little more than an acre, which produced fifty bushels of corn; while the whole twelve acres they had unsuccessfully attempted to hire, did not produce an equal quantity, though it was the best land in town. The worms eat it down as fast as it grew, till it became too late to plant again and secure a crop. And every one who assisted in cultivating the 'missionary field,' were blest with bountiful harvests on their own grounds."

There is no mistake as to the truth of the above statement. The Boston Recorder vouches for it. The fact is so well known, that "missionary fields" produce twelve times as much as other lands, that many of our cunning yankee neighbours hereabouts, have the craft to call every field they plant a "missionary field." In this way they get enormous crops. One man, last season, raised an immense number of potatoes on a half acre of land which was christened in the spring, "missionary field." There was not a potatoe in all the harvest which could be got out of the ground without hand-spikes, iron bars, chains and oxen. He makes a barn this winter of one potatoe, having cut a hole large enough to drive his cattle into one end, and his oxen, cows, horses and sheep will live and grow fat all winter eating down the internal walls of the potatoe. And what is still more miraculous is, that the land whereon the potatoes grew, was neither manured, plowed, planted or hoed during the whole season Friend Rand of the Recorder will please transfer these facts to his columns.—They will be in place by the side of his story about the woman in Maine who had never heard the name of Jesus Christ, though she had lived, from her infancy, next door to an orthodox meeting-house.

THE LAST NEW INVENTION.

We learn by the Visitor and Telegraph, an orthodox paper published in Richmond, Va. that at a late Fair in Lynchburgh, which was got up for the purpose of raising funds to build a new church, "a young lady," (we use the very words of the paper) "made sale of a chew of tobacco—a legal tender in '*Ould Virginia*'—at $5." One would think this was a pretty generous price for a single chew of tobacco; but the purchaser no doubt was a young man; and what gave the chief value to the quid, in his estimation, was, that he could lay it upon his own tongue warm from the delicate lips of this young, blooming member of the Chew Tobacco Society. Should this Society be extended through the country, the orthodox would secure to themselves the five dollar bills of almost every young man in the nation. Who

would not give five dollars to smack a chew of tobacco from the warm lips of a young lady?

Don't blame us, serious reader, for ridiculing this thing. How can, how ought such a procedure to be treated but with ridicule? Goldsmith used to say, that there was no weapon with which an enthusiast can be successfully opposed but ridicule.

LIFE BEFORE THE FLOOD.

In the shape of "Fragments of an Antediluvian Diairy," we have the following sketches, by Miss Jewsbury, of Manchester, whose name has lately come with much acceptance before the public.

The ideas are striking and poetical, and the language employed, well suited to the occasion.

* * * * To-day I am a hundred years old. How blissful are the feelings of boyhood! My senses are acute as the tree with a shrinking leaf. My blood bounds through my veins as the river pours through the valley, rejoicing in its strength. Life lies before me like another plain of Shimar—vast, unoccupied, inviting—I will fill it with achievements and pleasures! In about sixty years it will be time for me to think of marrying; my kinswoman Zillah will, by that time, have emerged from girlhood; she already gives promise, I hear, of comeliness and discretion. Twenty years hence I will pay a visit to her father, that I may see how she grows; meanwhile, I will build a city to receive her when she becomes my wife.

* * * * * * *

Nearly three centuries have passed away since my marriage. Can it be? It seems but yesterday since I sported like a young antelope round my father's tent, or, climbing the dark cedars, nestled like a bird among the thick boughs—and now I am a man in authority, as well as in the prime of life. I lead out my trained servants to the fight, and sit head of the council, beneath the very tree where, as an infant, my mother laid me to sleep. Jazad, my youngest born, a lovely babe of thirty summers, is dead; but I have four goodly sons remaining. And my three daughters are fair as their mother, when I first met her in the Acacia grove, where now stands one of my city watch-towers. They are the pride of the plain, no less for their acquirements than their beauty. No damsel carries the pitcher from the fountain with the grace of Adar; none can dry the summer fruits like Azubah—and none can fashion a robe of skins with the skill of Milcah. When their cousin Mahaleen has seen another half century, he shall take the choice of the three. * * * * *

My eight hundredth birth-day! And now I feel the approach of age and infirmity. My beard is become white as the blossoms of the almond tree. I am constrained to use a staff when I journey; the stars look less bright than formerly; the flowers smell less odorous; I have laid Zillah in the tomb in the rock; Milcah is gone to the dwelling of Mahaleel;—My sons take my place at the council and in the field;—all is changed. The long future is become the short past. The earth is full of violence; the ancient and the honourable are sinking beneath the young and the vicious.—The giants stalk through the length and breadth of the land, where once dwelt a quiet people; all is changed. The beasts of the field and the monsters of the deep growl and press on us with unwonted fury: traditions, visions, and threatenings, are abroad. What fearful doom hangs over this fair world, I know not: it is enough that I am leaving it; yet another five or eight score years, and the tale will be complete. But have I, in every deed, trod this earth nearly a thousand years? It is false; I am yet a boy. I have had a dream—a long, long, busy dream of buying and selling: marrying and giving in marriage, of building and planting; feasting and warring; sorrowing and rejoicing; loving and hating; but it is false to call it a life. Go to—it has been a vision of the night; and now that I am awake, I will forget it. "Lamech, my son, how long is it since we planted the garden of oaks beside the river? Was it not yesterday?" "My father, dost thou sport? Those oaks cast a broad shadow when my sister carried me beneath them in her arms, and wove me chaplets of their leaves." "Thou art right, my son; and I am old. Lead me to thy mother's tomb, and there leave me to meditate. What am I the better for my past length of being? Where will be its records when I am gone!—They are yonder—on all sides. Will those massy towers fall? Will those golden plains become desolate? Will the children that call me father forget? The seers utter hard sayings upon their harps, when they sing of the future; they say our descendants shall be men of dwindled stature; that the years of their lives shall be contracted to the span of our boyhood;—but what is that future to me? I have listened to the tales of Paradise—nay, in the blue distance, I have seen the dark tops of its cedars. I have heard the solemn melodies of Jubal when he sat on the sea shore, and the sound of the waves mingled with his harping. I have seen angels the visitants of men—I have seen an end of all perfection—what is the future to me?"

"VARIETY STORE"—*broken up.*—The Pittsburgh Statesman of Wednesday contains the following:—*A Dozen Rogues* were apprehended on Saturday last—and eleven were put in jail. They were in company, and the concern embraced all ages, sexes and conditions—Men, Women and Children. Their operations were equally diversified.—They stole and secreted in their depositories, Spirits of Turpentine, by

the barrel—Flour do. Rye, Corn, &c. by the bag. Pork in the hog; taking the "whole hog round,"—Jack Planes,—Bitts,—Augurs, Towels, and all kinds of *trumpery!* making a general and complete assortment, which collected, gives our Mayor's Office the appearance of a "Variety store." The several partners in this concern are now on trial—and we are told that the investigations will discover the names of many who have been secretly connected with this firm. We will publish the names of the principals, and the muster-roll of the subordinates, as soon as they may be ascertained.

"And for this cause, God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."—2 Thess. ii. 11 & 12 v.

A subscriber has requested an explanation of the above passages. The publisher feels sensible of his incapacity to answer the request, both on account of his experience in such discussions, and the inherent difficulties of the subject.

Why should God deceive his creatures? If the damnation spoken of, was to be experienced in another state of existence, could they not be damned for having pleasure in unrighteousness, unless Diety himself also sent them strong delusion? If we compare scripture with scripture, perhaps Paul may explain the matter. He admits that "God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear," [Rom. xi. 8,] but adds, "I say then have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid," &c. "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead? [v. 11 & 15] We suppose the damnation spoken of in Thessalonians alludes to great temporal evils and calamities, which were about to fall on those who had "pleasure in unrightcousness;" and that these calamities, whatever they were, or however they might be the effect of "delusion" sent from God, were not inconsistent with universal benevolence. The poor blinded sufferers were eventually to be received, as "life from the dead," and Paul declares very plainly, notwithstanding the casting away of the Jews, that "all Israel shall be saved." Christ and his saints, the elect, were the "first fruits" of God's creatures, and "if the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy." See the whole of the eleventh chapter of Romans.

DIED—In Genoa, on the 16th inst. Mr. RICHARD HALLETT, aged 46 years, after a severe illness of about 12 days. His disease was said to be an inflammation of the brain defying the most vigilant exertions of medical aid—worn out with pain and disease he sunk beneath the all conquering arm of the king of terrours. He had his reason until a few hours before his death and had a full sense of his approaching condition. He died a firm believer in the doctrine of Universal benevolence, which was evident from his character as a neighbour, his conduct as a citizen, (both of which was irreproachable and examplary) and from his own verbal assertion which has ever been in support of the doctrine of impartial grace. As a husband he was industrious and frugal, kind and compassionate, beloved as a father, temperate and economical as a man. He is an irrepairable and inestimable loss as a mechanic, and the almost only support of a large family, who have nought left of that firm pillar of support and guidance; a strong link in social happiness and fireside circle. But the widow has a husband, the fatherless a father, the mourner a comforter, and the stranger a home, "eternal in the Heavens"—to which we must all go, and where "every tear shall be wiped from our eyes;" where there is no "sickness, pain and death."

UNION OF PAPERS.

NEW ARRANGEMENT.

A weekly paper for One Dollar and Fifty cents.

The EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE, now in progress of the Third Volume at Utica, and GOSPEL ADVOCATE, now in progress of the Seventh Volume at Auburn, will on the 1st of January, 1830, be *united*, and published at Utica, N. Y. under the title of

Evangelical Magazine
AND GOSPEL ADVOCATE

It has been deemed expedient by all concerned, that these two papers should be united, and hereafter published in one. By this arrangement, subscribers will receive a much larger proportion of matter for the same price, and the interests and harmony of the friends of liberal christianity be greatly promoted. Utica, being the centre of a large and central state in the Union, and embracing every possible facility of communicating with all parts of this state, and with the great bodies of Universalists, East and West, is decidedly the best location for such a paper that could be selected.—As we have the assurance of receiving the aid and contributions of the principal and most talented Universalist writers in the state, as well as the continued aid of former correspondents, we hope by patience, perseverance, and unremitting exertions on our own part, to make this one of the most interesting (as well as cheapest) papers in the connexion; and to sustain for it all the reputation heretofore acquired by the two papers; one of which has been before the publick for about seven years, and the other about three.

The *Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate* will—as heretofore—be devoted principally to the inculcation and defence of Liberal Christianity, or the doctrine of God's impartial and universal grace, and the ultimate holiness and happiness of all his intellectual offspring: To sermons and essays, doctrinal, moral, and practical: To brief expositions and commentaries upon the Scriptures: To religious intelligence, poetic effusions, and miscellaneous matter: And last, but not least—to the determined defence of civil and religious liberty, against the craft of spiritual tyrants, and the wiles of the self-styled "orthodox" clergy, who are—many of them at least—aiming at nothing short of the total extinction of the light which guides

the children of the Reformation, and the entire prostration of our religious liberty, by the union of Church and State, and the establishment of a National Religion.

The modern but popular dogma of *endless misery*, appears to us irrational in the extreme, anti-scriptural, and fraught with the most unhappy and dreadful consequences. We view it as productive of a slavish fear, incompatible with love and cheerful obedience to God, as leading many to despair and a settled melancholy for life, and not unfrequently to still more fatal consequences. Hence, we shall endeavour by candid, fair, logical, and scriptural arguments, to disprove and root out of the minds of community, a doctrine which robs God of his glory, Jesus of his triumph, and man of a rational hope of life and happiness beyond the tomb; and to inculcate instead thereof, the peace-giving doctrine of Christ—that gospel which is "good tidings of great joy unto all people"—and the rational duty of man to "love God *because* he first loved us." We shall, however, always hold ourselves open to conviction, court investigation, avoid personal invective, and cheerfully admit into our columns communications from any, and all denominations of Christians, how much soever they may differ from us in sentiment, provided they are written in a spirit becoming the gospel: for we proscribe no man for his honest belief, but commend him for endeavouring to support it.

That there is an unholy league, a secret plot, entered into by the leading clergy of the "orthodox" party, (we except and exonerate from this charge many who are orthodox in sentiment,) to demolish the fair temple of American liberty, unite Church and State, erect an inquisitorial tribunal, and establish a hierarchy in this hitherto free country, is too plain, even from their own acknowledgements, to need any additional proof. We shall watch their movements with an observing eye, carefully scrutinize their pretensions, and promptly sound the alarm whenever we conceive the safety of our country requires it.

To our former patrons and subscribers, we say—Brethren, we thank you kindly for your friendly aid and support, thus far. We desire, we need, and hope we shall receive, the continuance of your support and countenance in future. Our cause is yet in its infancy in this region of country: but it is gradually progressing. And though we have a host of enemies and prejudices to contend against, yet let us not faint, nor "be weary in well doing; for in due time we shall reap if we faint not." The victory will soon be ours. You have witnessed the progress of liberal Christianity, and enlarged views of the Divine benevolence for a few years past, and many of you can witness that the Magazine and the Advocate have, through your liberality, been in some degree the humble means of speeding the work. Let us go on then—as we believe ours to be the cause of God, of truth, and of humanity—in mutually assisting each other, and doing good to the present and to future generations. Every good subscriber who withdraws his patronage, in some measure discourages our undertaking; and every new and good subscriber added to our list, strengthens our hand and encourages our heart.

All present subscribers, either for the Advocate or the Magazine, will be considered as subscribers for this, unless they give notice to the contrary.

As the *price* of this paper is so very low, it is necessary that all our subscribers be not only *able* but *willing* to *pay for it;* for such alone will enable us to pay our PRINTERS and Paper-Makers. Therefore the utmost punctuality will be expected of subscribers.

CONDITIONS.

The MAGAZINE AND ADVOCATE will be published every Saturday, on fine white paper and good type, on a full sheet medium, in quarto form,—or, on a very large imperial half sheet, which shall contain, by close printing, an equal quantity of matter to a whole medium sheet, and its pages about the same size;—8 pages in each number, 416 in the volume, with a complete Index at the close of the year. The volume will contain just twice as much matter as a volume of the Magazine now does, and at least one third more than the Advocate now does.

PRICE $1 50 *in advance*, or $2 if not paid in advance or within three months from the time the first No. is received. Agents who obtain *eight* subscribers, and become responsible for them, (or companies paying for eight copies,) will be allowed the *ninth copy gratis;* and in the same proportion for a greater number. No subscriptions received for a less time than one year, (unless the money be paid in advance,) and no paper discontinued till all arrearages are paid. Universalist Ministers, and Post Masters friendly to the objects of this publication, are requested to act as agents. All communications to the Editor and Publisher must be *post-paid*, or *free*.

Subscribers' names to be forwarded previous to the first of January, if practicable, or as soon thereafter as convenient, to

DOLPHUS SKINNER, *Utica, N. Y.*

Or if more convenient for the present patrons of the Advocate, names and remittances may be forwarded to *U. F. Doubleday, Auburn.*

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance. to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

AND IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATOR.

HAVE WE NOT ALL ONE FATHER?....HATH NOT ONE GOD CREATED US?....MALACHI.

VOL. VII.] AUBURN, N. Y. SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1829. [NO. 25.

THE PREACHER.

Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.'

A SERMON.

Delivered at Charlestown, Mass. July 12, 1829.

BY L. S. EVERETT.

"After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name."—Matthew vi. 9.

It must afford great comfort to a devotional heart, to be allowed to call God its Father.—The privilege of so doing, awakens a delightful sense of that endearing relationship which subsists between the Creator, and the creature; and gives birth to those devotional aspirations, and that holy gratitude, which annihilate all doubt, and place the worshipper at the foot of that throne, whose foundation is goodness, and whose occupant is love.

In *prosperity*, a sense of this relationship adds a zest to every enjoyment, and strength to every moral obligation. In *adversity*, it soothes the throbbing heart, and mitigates its woes. It guards and guides our wayward feet, and serves to make our pilgrimage on earth comfortable, and oftentimes delightful. It raises our contemplative powers to the great source of all being and happiness—adds dignity to human nature—and imparts the hope of heaven.

The truth of any fact does not depend upon our belief or disbelief of it; yet it is folly to imagine that this relationship can afford any happiness, unless we understand and believe that it does exist. The fact, to us, is useless until we know it,—for so long as ignorance pervades the mind, the affections of the heart will remain in a state of alienation. The invitation of divine mercy, therefore, is—"acquaint now thyself with God, and be at peace." In other words, we are required to learn that God *is* our Father, that we *are* his children, and that all men *are* brothers, in order that we may respect him as such, and keep his commandments, by loving our fellow beings.

The importance of a timely recognition of the relation in which we stand to the Almighty, may be ascertained and properly appreciated by attending to the following reflections.

1. In the interesting and momentous season of *youth* it is highly beneficial to know that God is a Father. It is then that the mind forms its habit of thinking; and all who have realized the force of early impressions will understand me when I say, that much of the happiness of after life depends upon the conceptions first entertained of the character of God. If *then* conceived of as a changeable, tyrannical, or cruel Being—disposed to place his creatures at an infinite distance from himself, and to multiply candidates for perdition, that he may sport with their present and future welfare, it will require years of study and sober reflection to eradicate those impressions. And, indeed, it is probable that such ideas will continue to harrass the mind through life, and disturb the tranquility of death.

It is firmly believed, that most of the fearful apprehensions of the dying may be imputed to early impressions; and to the same cause may be attributed those recantations which are so vehemently urged as proof of the incorrectness of our faith: When the body is weak the mind is weak; and then, the impressions of childhood and youth return with all their force, and the convictions of sober reason are forgotten or overpowered.

But farther; a sense of the parental character of God is calculated to restrain the *passions*, and subdue the *propensities* of the young. This is peculiarly true of the influence it has in elevating the views, the conceptions, the desires, and the hopes of youth. The first step towards making a man dishonest is to accuse him of crime—the first step towards making the youth a child of the devil, is to tell him that such is the fact. On the contrary, let the young know and make them feel, that they are children of God, and that a high and holy destiny awaits them, and they will be careful not to dishonour their divine parentage, or prove themselves unworthy of the favours designed for them.

2. As we grow up and enter upon the stage of action, and become partakers of the common trials, toils, comforts, blessings and evils of life, then a realizing sense of the fact that God is our Father, is indispensably necessary. To be happy, while living "without hope and without God in the world," is next to impossible; but a still more important fact is this: Without a knowledge of the relationship which binds us to God and Him to us, we cannot act wisely and prudently towards our own children.

It is as evident as any moral certainty can be, that our most correct and useful opinions are the fruits of education. By this I mean that the views we entertain of our duty to God, ourselves, our neighbours, and our children,

have been derived from an acquaintance with the kind and parental character of God. By a sober consideration of the parental kindness and divine benignity of the Almighty, we learn how to direct our conduct and govern our passions; —and farther, such knowledge enlarges and purifies our affections, and induces us to deal justly, love mercy, and walk humbly.

3. In seasons of prosperity we stand in need of the information that God is our Father.—When life glides smoothly along, and success attends our efforts, there is great danger. Then we are liable to forget that we are dependent upon God and our fellow creatures for most of the enjoyments which fall to our lot. But even then, if a sense of the relation of which I am speaking, is cherished in our hearts, we have a safeguard, which, with a blessing from on high, will keep us within due bounds. But,

4. In the day of trial, in seasons of adversity, a proper sense of this relationship is of great importance—it is then indispensible.

It is a source of great comfort to reflect, in seasons of affliction, upon this sublime and interesting truth, that God is our Father. The thought brings peace and gratitude with it, and fills up an aching void in the heart. Doubtless many of my hearers have experienced the benefits and blessings of this truth. In seasons of gloom and despondency, when heart and flesh were about to fail, has it not occurred to our minds that God was yet our friend and our Father? and did not this reflection diffuse a holy calm over the soul and shed abroad that peace which passeth all understanding? If not, our professions have thus far been in vain.

This world is filled with misery: And it would be strange indeed, if all of us had not endured a share of it. An effectual remedy for this evil is furnished in the revelation the Almighty has made of his character. His character is revealed both in the bible, and in the great volume of Nature, in language so plain that the way-faring man may read and understand. It is, therefore, an inestimable privilege that we have, and may, if we will, improve and enjoy, in seasons of trial, to turn our thoughts to heaven, and say, in the emphatic language of our Lord—"*Our* Father."

When friends forsake us, that blessing remains to us—the gift of God. Who has not felt the pains of unrequited friendship? In this changing world the love of self predominates in almost every heart; and it would be strange indeed if collisions of interest did not sometimes, nay, frequently, destroy our peace or mar our happiness. We need not resort to the visions of the poet, or to the phantasms of the novelist, to find a delineation of this kind of misery. We see it pourtrayed in the faded cheek, the glistening eye, the withering form of many a child of woe in real life. And perhaps we, too, may have felt the pains of confidence abused, of innocence betrayed, of kindness unrequited, or of love unheeded and unreturned. And is it not true, that when the last tie of friendship, the last bond of confidence, the last ligament of love which may have so tenderly and so enchantingly bound us to earth, and its inhabitants has been broken asunder, —when every earthly prospect has been blasted, as with the mildew of death—when our earthly future has been dark, and forbidding—when there was no heart left to sympathize with us—when there was no soul left to melt at a recital of our woes;—is it not true, I say, that then, we have felt the force of the truth—and the efficacy of the truth, that we had a friend in heaven, and that He is our Father?

It may be painful, but I trust it will be profitable for us, to look back upon the scenes of adversity through which we may have passed that the value of the truth I am labouring to inculcate may be properly estimated and duly appreciated.

Some of my hearers have been called to the bed-side of a dying child, to behold the last look, to hear the last expression of affection, to witness the last convulsive effort of expiring nature! And when the solemn conviction has been forced upon the mind that the loved one is no more—when the painful reality has found its way to a parent's bleeding heart, and has opened the flood-gates of parental tenderness —O, then, did it not mitigate the woe that cannot be expressed, to reflect, that the spirit which had "shuffled off its mortal coil" had gone from a world of trouble to the God who gave it, and that the Being into whose bosom it had fled, was its father, and our father?

When the husband has looked upon the lifeless form of the partner of his joys and his sorrows, and has realized that the angel of his earthly paradise is no more—when the reality bursts upon the mind with the solemnity of the eternal world, that her faithful heart shall never again beat in unison with his own—that the mother of his children shall never more smooth his pillow with her plastic hand—that the bosom which has been the sacred repository of his confidence has ceased to heave the generous sigh—and that the soul from which ascended the incense of prayer in his behalf has fled from earth to heaven—O, then, was there not some comfort to be derived from kneeling where she knelt—from praying where she prayed—and from addressing her Father and our Father?

Or, when the wife leans over the couch of her dying husband, and beholds the lamp of life flickering in its socket—or when she sees his once sturdy form and active limbs, prostrate, inanimate, and cold—and when she becomes painfully conscious of her forlorn situation, and casts a fond look upon her fatherless children, may we not presume that it will afford her some comfort to reflect that God is the father of her fatherless babes, and a friend to the widowed heart?

Or when our fathers and mothers, borne down with the weight of their years and infirmities, are called to a state of rest—when our last act of kindness has been done—when our last effort has been made—and the last hope of their continuance is gone; then it will afford us divine comfort to know, and to feel, that we have yet a parent—" our Father which art, &c."

And when, at last, we ourselves are called upon to leave the world, and give up our claim upon its comfort, and relinquish our share of its vanities,—when earthly things recede, and heaven opens to our enraptured view—O, then may the joy be ours, of pronouncing the endearing name—" our Father!"—

Much more might be said to show the importance of having a proper sense of the relationship which subsists between us and our Creator; but from these hints the attentive hearer will be enabled to pursue a train of reflection which will supercede the necessity of a farther enlargement upon this interesting topick of our present discouse

In the 2nd place;—I may be allowed to observe, that all mankind are *required* to recognize God as a Father. This is the plain import of our Saviour's instructions to those who listened to his inimitable sermon on the Mount. A *multitude* followed him; and *to the multitude* he said—" After this manner pray ye:" " Our Father, &c."

These words, therefore, and with them the *truth* that all mankind are *required* to consider God as a Father, are put into our mouths. No intelligent being, however humble, or however sinful he or she may be, is, or can be, by any edict of man, exonerated from the duty thus enjoined. And more than all this,—there never was; there never will be, a moment in our lives, nor in eternity, when we shall be, or have been, free from this obligation. God was our Father yesterday—he is our Father to day—he will be our Father forever! And what is true in relation to us, is true in relation to all mankind. And more;—God is our Father as much at one time as at another; and though we may be ignorant of this divine, eternal, and endearing relationship, yet our ignorance can never destroy it. True, our ignorance may seriously effect our happiness; it may deprive us of the joys and comforts of which I have spoken, but it can never make the truth a lie, nor the faithfulness of God of no effect.

3rd. God is the Father of all mankind by right of creation. He is entitled to that appellation, and to all the honours of it, because, he hath created of one blood all the nations of the earth. Or as implied in the language of Malichi,—" have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?" " He made us and not we ourselves." The same fact is set forth in the supply of our temporal and spiritual wants. The invisible things of God, and the kindness of his nature are made known in the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead. The provisions he has made for our comfort here, and the bounties of his grace in a blissful hereafter, entitle him to our thanks and ceaseless gratitude. He is indeed a Father and a friend, or he would not have blessed us with favours so large, and benefactions so free!

But in the great work of redemption his parental kindness and fatherly love appear in all the loveliness of active and impartial goodness.

> " He sent his Son, with power to save
> From guilt and darkness, and the grave."—

And thus, by an act which caused angels to rejoice, he hath commended his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners—even while neglecting his authority and despising his reproofs—while alienated from him; and his enemies by wicked works—he sent his Son to save us! It was in view of all this—this surprising goodness and amazing condescension that our Lord Jesus Christ, soon after he commenced his labours of love on earth, expressed our obligations to his God and our God, to his Father and our Father! Let us then, improve this truth by attending to the doctrinal and practical influence to be drawn from it—and

1. If God is our Father, we need not fear that he will ever deny us a share of comfort here on earth. We have seen that he has blessed us, and judging of what we may expect, by what we have received, we may conclude, that " He will never leave nor forsake us." His tender mercies always have been—they are—they always will be, over all his works. He has from time out of mind, opened his hand and supplied the wants of every living thing: he will continue to be thus kind forever and ever. Yet, how prone we are to forget all this and murmur against his wise dispensations! Though unable to fathom his goodness or soar in the amplitude of his love, we too often find fault with our fate, and complain against his munificent benefactions!

Frail creatures though we are, we sometimes think his mercies too small, and his judgments too severe; and even while indebted to him for the breath we spend in complaining, our impotent minds presume to suggest plans for the improvement of his wise economy! Let us remember, that it is the prerogative of Almighty Love to rule, and the privilege of his children to submit. Let us rest assured, hereafter, that God our Father will do that for his children which shall be for their good and his glory.

2. Since God is our Father, he will afflict us no more than is for our greatest good. True, it is hard to have our friends taken from us and borne to the silent tomb. O, yes! it was hard to part with that dear child,—with that kind brother—with that affectionate sister—with that beloved husband—with that lovely wife—with that venerated father—with that fond, loving mother! Nature, and affection, and reli-

gion itself, required that we should love them! But, where have they gone? We saw them cold in death,—we closed their eyes,—we pronounced their names, but they answered not;—the places that knew them, now know them no more—they were placed in the tabernacle of the departed—and their spirits have returned to the God who gave them! And who is God? "*Our father!*"

Now, although no affliction is for the present joyous, let us remember that all our sorrows are designed to yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness. Perhaps they are sent upon us like heavenly visitants, to teach us the necessity of having constantly before our eyes the lesson inculcated in our text. If we have sinned, therefore, let us return to this best of parents—yea, "to the Lord, who will have mercy upon us, and to our God who will abundantly pardon." And let us bear in mind that "He doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men."

3. If God is our Father, he will never *punish* us any more than shall be for our good. This proposition is so evident and palpable a truth, that were it not for the erroneous impressions mankind have received from false systems of theology, I should not be under the necessity of saying any thing to prove it. As it is, my remarks will be brief.

Every parent knows, or ought to know, that punishment can never be justly inflicted on any other principle than for the benefit of the one punished. And every parent worthy of the name, would feel indignant to be accused of having punished a child merely to gratify a spirit of cruelty or revenge. The difference between punishing for the benefit of the one punished, and punishing from motives of revenge is great; and the distinction should be carefully observed by every inquirer after truth. In the former case, every pang is designed to produce reformation, and is carefully adapted to that end; in the latter, no regard is paid to the welfare of the creature, and every blow is appreciated by the satisfaction it affords the one who gives it.

We have probably witnessed instances in which parents under the influence of anger and ignorance, have vented their malice upon their children; and I venture to affirm, that none of us ever beheld such a scene, without feeling indignant at such conduct. Nothing can ever justify such an abuse of power, unless it should appear that brutality is indeed a characteristic of human nature. The man, or the woman, who should be guilty of such conduct, would be considered, and justly so, a disgrace to our species.

How, then, can we excuse ourselves for saying of God that he will punish his children eternally? Will the best of all parents do that which would disgrace the meanest and most unworthy of his creatures? Will "our Father which art in heaven" afflict his offspring; beings, who are required to love him because he is lovely; to bless him because he is good; to adore him because he is worthy of all adoration; and to approach into his presence with thanksgiving and prayer as they would come up before a kind earthly parent? Will such a being, I say, afflict or punish his offspring, upon whom these obligations are made binding by his goodness, when he knows, and we know, and angels know, and devils know (if there be any) that such punishment can never do any good? It cannot be! One pang, other than our good requires, inflicted by a careless or revengeful hand, would shake the eternal throne to its centre—would abrogate every moral rule, and drive the intellectual world to ruin and despair!

But the hearer may reply—"We are the Lord's by right of creation, and his too, by right of redemption; and being his creatures he has the right to do what he will with his own."—But may I not ask—does power give the right to do wrong? If so, may not earthly tyrants be justified on the same principle? Have parents the right to punish their children unmercifully? Have the rulers of the earth the right to inflict punishment when it can do no good? If so what rights do the *people* enjoy? I thank God the principle I am opposing has never been adopted in this county, and I pray Heaven it never may be. And again:—What authority have we for saying that we are the Lord's by right of redemption, unless we are effectually, and of grace alone, redeemed from all the evils of sin, in the council of God? What claim has the Almighty upon our love, our gratitude, our obedience, our thanks, or our prayers, unless it is on the ground that he has first loved and redeemed us?

But it may be asked, has not our creator a right to punish us for his *own glory*? Yes—emphatically so. Yet it remains to be seen that it *will be for his glory*, to punish mankind any more than will be for *their good*. God's glory can never be promoted or secured by an act of injustice, any more than an earthly tyrant can obtain glory by acts of cruelty and oppression. A tyrant may obtain fame in this way; but such fame is the glory of infamy, and the curse of notoriety. Such wanton depredations upon the happiness of mankind can never be entitled to the approbation of good men. We may shudder before the power that can afflict, yet we cannot love that power nor the being who possesses it, whether it be God, or man. Outward obedience—or rather the appearance of it may be extorted; but even while we bend beneath the lash of torture the soul would indignantly exclaim—

> "Go to your bloody rites again—bring back
> The hall of horrours and the assessors pen,
> Recording answers shrieked upon the rack;
> Smile o'er the gaspings of spine-broken men;—

Preach—perpetuate damnation in your den;—
Then let your altars, ye blasphemers! peal
With thanks to heaven, that let you loose again,
To practice deeds with torturing fire and steel
No eye may search—no tongue may challenge or reveal;

And it would be impossible, after all, to produce submission by such means,—equally so, to obtain glory by the infliction of unnecessary punishment. God, therefore, may punish his children for his own glory, but in order to be glorified he must be just—in order to be just he must be merciful—in order to be merciful he must save all mankind.

Hence, it will appear, that our Saviour's injunction rests upon the broad foundation of eternal and unpurchased love, resulting, as love necessarily must, in the greatest possible good of all its objects. We are required to pray to our *Father!* that endearing name in which we live, and move, and have our being! We are required to approach him, as we would approach our own parents, with that holy faith in his gracious promises, "which works by love &c."

And more yet:—When we enter his courts with praise, or his gates with thanksgiving, and address him as "our Father" we are required to add—"hallowed be thy name."—This reverential offering up of our gratitude should be in conformity to the thoughts of our hearts, the words of our lips, and the works of our hands. It should be—not the fruits of fanaticism, nor the outpourings of ignorance, nor the offering of stupidity—but it should be the work of the understanding, the homage of intelligence, the oblation of reason. Our language should be—"Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give the glory, for thy mercy, and for thy truth's sake. Teach me thy way, O, Lord; I will walk in thy truth; unite my heart to fear thy name; I will praise thee O, Lord my God, with all my heart; and I will glorify thy name forevermore. O, Lord, open thou my lips; and my mouth shall shew forth thy praise." And this should be said with the full purpose of heart, "that whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we will do all to the praise and glory of God."

And how can we serve God more acceptably than by speaking of his loving kindness to the children of men? how can we better hallow his name, than by calling him our Father? And, as relates to our duty to ourselves and others, how can we better promote the great end and object of our being, than by labouring industriously to spread abroad a knowledge of the character, perfections, and purposes of the Most High?

Brethren and friends! As often as we open the word of God we find renewed assurances of his parental kindness and tender mercy. Every precept, every promise, every prophetic declaration, every command, every threatning, within the lids of the sacred volume, is replete with divine comfort. And, when we turn our thoughts upon the stupendous works of nature—when we consider the heavens, the work of his hands; the worlds and systems of worlds which fill the immensity of space, we are led to inquire, with astonishment, yet with gladness—"What is man"—poor feeble man—"that thou shouldst be mindful of him, or the sons of men that thou shouldst visit them?"

But this question is answered in our text.—The Lord God of Gods is mindful of us all, because he is our Father, and we are his children. This fact unfolds the mystery, and informs us why it is that we live in the enjoyment of so many blessings here, and why we are provided for with greater in the world to come.

Let us, then, supplicate the throne of parental goodness, that a knowledge of this divine relationship may be exhibited in our intercourse with our fellow beings, and redound to the glory of God.—AMEN.

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS.

MINUTES, &c.

The Genesee Association of Universalists met, agreeble to previous notice, at Le Roy, Genesee County, on Wednesday, September 23, 1829, and proceeded to organize the council by appointing

Br. J. S. FLAGLER. *Moderator.*

Br. A. PECK, and Br. L. L. SADLER, } *Clerks.*

After having united in solemn and devout prayer to Almighty God, with Br. O. A. Ackley, received and examined the credentials of delegates and letters from the Societies in fellowship with this Association, and found them generally expressive of prosperity, and containing good news of heart-cheering intelligence.

Voted, to receive the Le Roy and Albion Societies into the Fellowship of this Association.

Heard and accepted the report of the Committee of Discipline for the last year.

Appointed Brs. Liscomb, Knapp, O. A. Ackley, and Isaac Whitnall, a Committee of Discipline for the ensuing year.

Appointed Brs. O. A. Ackley, Isaac Whitnal, and Liscomb Knapp a committee to receive requests for letters of fellowship, or for ordination.

In consequence of Br. W. I. Reese's removal from the jurisdiction of this Association, and his having presented a petition or request to be discharged from further duties as Standing Clerk of this Association—Voted, that Br. J. S. Flagler be his successor as Standing Clerk.

Made arrangements for publick worship, and adjourned the council till after service.

Order of Morning Service.—Introductory

prayer by Br. J. S. Flagler. Sermon by Br. A. Peck. Text, Psalm xix. 7. Concluding prayer by Br. Calvin Morton.

Order of Service P. M.—Introductory prayer by Br. Isaac Whitnal. Sermon by Br. Samuel Skeele. Text, Daniel vii. 14. Concluding prayer by Br. O. A. Ackley.

Met in council and voted, that quarterly meetings be held in various parts of the province of the Association during the ensuing year, *to wit*:—On the 5th Sabbath occurring in Nov. 1829, in Penfield, Monroe co. On the 5th Sabbath of Jan. in Benton, Yates co. On the 5th Sabbath of May in Dansville, Steuben co. On the 5th Sabbath of August in Alexander, Genesee co.

After having united with Br. J. Holiday in prayer, adjourned the council until Thursday morning.

Order of Evening Service.—Introductory prayer by Br. J. S. Flagler. Sermon by Br. Isaac Whitnal. Text, Deut. xxxii. 1—4.—Concluding prayer by Br. L. L. Sadler. Lectures were also delivered in the evening, in the vicinity, by Brs. O. A. Ackley and S. Fuller.

Met on Thursday morning and opened the council by uniting with Br. L. Knapp in devout prayer.

Appointed the following Brethren to attend the several Associations of Universalists in this State, *to wit*:—Brs. O. A. Ackley and J. S. Flagler, the Cayuga Association: Brs. Samuel Skeele and A. Peck, the Central Assoc.: Brs. J. Whitnal and L. Knapp, the St. Lawrence Assoc.: Br. Skeele and O. A. Ackley, the Black River Assoc.: Br. Calvin Morton, the Hudson Assoc.: Br. Upson, the Eatonbush Assoc.: and Br. J. Holiday, the Chenango Association.

Voted, that Br. A. Peck prepare the minutes of this Association for the press, accompany the same with a Circular, and transmit a copy to the Editor of the Gospel Advocate for publication.

Voted, that this Association be adjourned to meet at Albion on the second Wednesday and Thursday of October 1830.

Order of Publick Service A. M.—Introductory prayer by Br. J. Whitnal. Sermon by L. Knapp. Text, Psalms cxxxiii. 1—3. Concluding prayer by Br. J. S. Flagler.

Order of Service P. M.—Introductory prayer by A. Peck. Sermon by O. A. Ackley.—Text, Gal. iv. 26. An appropriate address to the Association by J. S. Flagler. Concluding prayer by I. Whitnal.

Br. Doubleday—By recurring to the Minutes it will be seen that Br. A. Peck was to prepare them for publication; and why he has not so done is to me unknown. But I impute it to indisposition of body or some contingent circumstance. Were I acquainted with his place of residence, I should have written him on this subject ere this. But as I know not where he may be found, and cannot determine the cause of delay, it is thought advisable for me, as I was one of the Clerks and kept a copy of the proceedings of the Association, to forward the Minutes, &c. for publication.

The Ministers and Delegates composing the Genesee Association, and especially Br. Peck, will please pardon me for assuming this liberty.

I do not feel authorized and therefore should not deem it justifiable for me to write a circular; and shall therefore only make a few observations respecting the circumstances attending our annual meeting. Should Br. Peck be able to write an epistle, we trust he will forward it to the editor of the Gospel Advocate immediately.

It is with peculiar pleasure and fond emotions of joy, that we announce to our brethren in the belief of a world's salvation through the merits of a crucified Redeemer, and to the wide spread family of man, that the whole session was attended with uninterrupted harmony, perfect peace and brotherly love. The voice of our council was unanimous, and no dissensions, strife, schisms, bitter envyings, and bickering, disturbed the quietude of our meeting. Our deliberations upon the adoption of proper measures to advance the interests of our Zion, and promote the cause of humanity, truth, wisdom, virtue, and our holy religion were conducted in a manner becoming the gospel of Christ, and nothing occurred to mar our felicity or sap our peace.

Notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, a large and respectable concourse of people assembled to the banquet of the Lord, or gospel feast; and while the bread of life was broken, and the luxurious provisions of Heaven's exhaustless storehouse were administered, each bosom seemed to heave with raptures of fond delight, and fullness of joy gladdened each countenance. The melodious voices of the choir of singers, that chaunted praises to the living God, called into exercise the finer feelings of our nature,—elevated our affections above the narrow boundaries of sordid selfishness, and kindled in our bosoms the flame of pure devotion.

The cordiality, true friendship, and christian kindness with which we were received by our Brethren at Le Roy—the hospitality, peculiar attention and liberality with which we were treated, during our stay among them, will long be remembered in gratitude by the recipients of their beneficence. In short, nothing seemed to be wanting to contribute to the happiness of the session; and the moments that we here devoted to social intercourse with our friends in the faith, to the upbuilding of Zion's cause, and to religious and divine worship, will be reckoned among the happiest of our lives.

One circumstance I cannot forbear noticing. Our friends at Le Roy, sometime previous to

the Association, requested the Methodist Society to favour us with the use of their Conventicle for publick worship. They partially granted consent by giving encouragement.—But when the time of our assembling drew near, they, to their everlasting infamy, refused to suffer us to enter within the precincts of their sacred temple. This conduct of Wesley's followers justly excited the indignation of the citizens of Le Roy, and accordingly the Presbyterian Church, much to the honour and credit of those who worship there, was opened for our reception and accommodation. And while we return our gratitude to them for this mark of kindness and christian liberality, we leave the Methodists to reflect upon their conduct, and judge for themselves whether they do not that which they disallow.

L. L. SADLER.

Pembroke, Nov. 24, 1829.

[The following was received after the foregoing was in type.]

GENERAL EPISTLE.

The Association of Universalists: To the Societies in their fellowship; and the labourers of like precious faith scattered abroad—Christians of every name and order—and to all wherever this epistle may come—send salutations of peace.

BRETHREN—We met at our anniversary in love; were welcomed with hospitality and cordial affection by our friends; worshipped as we trust in the unity of the spirit and the bonds of peace; and our deliberations were conducted in harmony. Our hearts were joyed by the intelligence we received from various societies. Grateful to our feeling was the assemblage of a large concourse of people.—With pleasure we listened to the ministration of the word; and while our understandings were enlightened and edified, our hearts were warmed and elevated.

By conclusive arguments, lucid illustrations, and a powerful application, there was impressed upon our minds the glorious and benevolent law by which God governs man—the universality of his dominion—the impartiality of his grace, perfection, and permanency of his plans—the duty of man to his fellow race as constituting the joy of heaven—and the lasting love and parental kindness with which we are remembered of our God till the heavenly inheritance is ours. It was truly a happy season to us all; and we believe that truth rested with its important might upon the hearts of many: and we felt it an indispensable duty to send the tidings of our joy and peace, and our good will to the Zion of God.

Brethren in the Ministry—When at such seasons we rejoice with joy almost unspeakable, why, O why, should there be such a general languishing throughout the land? Is there not a famine sore and oppressing? "Not a famine of bread nor a thirst for water, but for hearing the word of the Lord." Yours is the pleasing and important duty (the scriptures being the man of your counsel, and Rev. assisting you,) "to expound the way of God more perfectly;" to bring from the "store-house things new and old;" and to administer (if you are "first a partaker of heavenly things,") of the "bread of life and the water of life" to the famishing and needy soul. Let us then fervently and sincerely and unitedly pray that God "will abundantly bless her provisions and satisfy her poor with bread—clothe her priests with SALVATION, that her saints may shout aloud for joy. Brethren, look around you—see the circumstances of your fellow race—reflect on your duties as ministers of Jesus—let heaven witness your faithfulness and zeal, and humanity feel the effects of your exertions, and realize the blessings of your labours. Are you called, or do you find opportunity, to visit the house of sickness, when "flesh and heart fails," every earthly comfort has fled, and the soul seems to stand hovering on the brink of eternity—endeavour to inspire calmness and composure—bring to view the affections of a God, and the labours of love performed by Jesus—the fidelity of heaven—the blessings of immortality and eternal life—impart the joys of your faith, and the lessons of comfort you have received from the sacred word. Does the house of mourning claim a share of your attention? In order that mourners should not "mourn as those who have no hope," hold forth the *hope* of the gospel—teach the glorious and sublime doctrine of the resurrection from the dead. Has a brother or a sister been unkindly and uncourteously deceived by a minister of darkness, so as to despair of mercy from heaven, labour to undeceive them by the truth and consolations of the gospel, and by an exhibition of the glorious and perfect attributes of God. Are people losing their interest in *religion*, and is the love of many waxing cold? taunts and reproaches should be laid aside. Strong and lively appeals should be affectionately and feelingly made to their mental and moral faculties,—heaven's love for man, with the consequences of obedience and disobedience, taught and unfolded; and from considerations of christian experience, they should be inspirited and awakened, to stand as witnesses for God and for the testimony of Jesus. Brethren, there is a lamentable defection, both spiritual and moral. "Beware then, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." A frequent objection urged against our order, is the tendency of the doctrines to licentiousness, and charges of immorality against our leading members. We can repel argument by argument; but allegations of immorality are more successfully warded off, by

a "well ordered life and conversation." Study then to "show yourselves approved unto God," —workmen that need not be ashamed; patterns of meekness and piety, of charity and good works. Enforce the moral and practical duties. Teach by example as well as by precept. And may the Lord bless you in all things, and grant that you may "come off conquerors, and more than conquerors, through him that loved us."

We would also say to the societies in our connexion, and to our brethren and sisters associated. The ostensible objects of your union, is the enjoyment of greater privileges, and the advancement of the cause and influence of truth. If you "forsake the assembling of yourselves together as the manner of some is," wherein are your greater privileges enjoyed? Or if you withhold the weight of your example, wherein is the influence of truth advanced or the cause in which you are engaged promoted? If your covenant-pledge is "to Christ as disciples, and to each other as brethren and sisters in the Lord," as disciples follow your master through evil as well as through good report, and as brethren and sisters, exercise social charities and brotherly kindness. And if, in the promotion of your object, you find it necessary to have the preached word, let your encouragement be prompt and proportionate: and while you are ministered unto in "spiritual things," forget not "to return of your carnal things." And if your pleasure would be to have a "workman that needeth not to be ashamed," do not countenance indolence, nor at the same time oblige a man to be sedulously employed six days in a week, in secular affairs, for his living. Your priest must not be a rustick; there must be some improvement: not meanly clad, so as to be despised and neglected: not a worldling, but spiritual minded: not always at home, but must visit with the society, so as to cultivate social intercourse, and become acquainted with their views, interests and feelings. Consider then your own wishes and feelings. Consult your own ideas of ministerial duties; and endeavour, according to your several ability, to administer to the necessity and relieve the wants of your brother in Christ. Frequently is it the case, when death is making his ravages through the land, the minister is called ten or twenty miles from home. He must be ready on his part, and the industrious faithful housewife on hers. He must be willing—indeed it will not do to make any excuse. Remember them then in your charities. Brethren, you are surrounded by a multitude of opposers, "strewing fire brands, arrows and death." How necessary then that you have among you one who can "rightly divide the word of truth," "wield the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God," and contend against "spiritual wickedness in high places," minister to your edification and consolation; and surely the labourer ought to be "worthy of his hire." Indulge us with one word more. Fail not to represent yourselves by "*two delegates*" at the yearly sessions of the Association, and in your epistle we should like to learn your wishes, circumstances and prospects.

We have also a word to say to our brethren and sisters in the faith of illimitable goodness, scattered and widely dispersed throughout the land, who do not enjoy the privileges of organized societies, and the benefits of the preached word. Since the truth has found its way to your understanding, and you are blessed with its heavenly light and influence, in a certain sense you are "set for the defence of the gospel," and you can each in your own sphere, however circumscribed it may be, aid and assist in the promulgation of the truth and duties of religion. So far as your circumstances and ability permits, we would advise that you should encourage and promote the circulation of some periodical, having for its object true, consistent theology. But, above all, familiarize and acquaint yourselves with the scriptures; and so far as you can have the forbearance of your neighbours, endeavour to inculcate rational religion. Will they be offended to hear you speak of the goodness of God, and your enjoyment of his love? Let your light shine before men—your conversation be seasoned with grace. Maintain practical piety and godliness, and fight the good fight of faith. Be ever on your guard against the impositions of crafty and designing men, who are undoubtedly seeking to establish an ecclesiastical hierarchy and dominion. And we do feel that the liberties of our country are assailed, our free institutions in jeopardy, while they are laughing us in the face for our fears: they are begging our money, picking our pockets, carrying off our substance, to carry on their plans.—Shall we sit at our ease, hold our hands, and say the people are too enligetened to suffer attempts upon our liberties? Of what avail are literary acquirements, political or religious knowledge, while we remain inert and neglect to oppose their measures? or, what is still worse, contribute to their Sunday schools and tract societies, and patronize their "Pioneer." It is high time that every politician and christian should act. Every friend to his country; well wisher to posterity, lover of the simple doctrines of Jesus, opposer of tyranny, and hater of craft and fraud, should unitedly, and vigorously, and openly, not only protest but oppose.

Christians of every name and order—With you we would fain unite in the suppression of vice and immorality, in the advancement of the cause of truth, and the gospel of SALVATION. But when we see every thing so organized and systematized that all the benevolent exertions of community must be under priestly

control, inspection and influence; tending to enrich the treasury, and enlarge the funds of those who would establish a "christian party in politicks," and who from their unjust assumptions in State, and undue influence over puerile weakness, and adult prejudices; and who from their pharisaic ambition of popular applause; are undoubtedly seeking the ascendency and supremacy, that they may lord it over God's heritage:—We do solemnly protest and aver, that we will *never*, no NEVER as we love the liberties of our country—regard the happiness of our offspring—or revere the name of God—lend the benefit of our influence, nor give a portion of our money.

Brethren of our common parent—We are all interested in the Religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is a light to our feet and a lamp to our path—a guide and conductor through the pilgrimage of life—and a comfort to our declining years. It inspires the pleasing hopes of heaven. It warms the frozen affections, and benignly influences the heart to love. It is the regulator of our conduct, hushing the contending passions into peace. "It teaches that denying ungodliness and worldly desires we should live soberly, righteously and godly." It is a solace to the mourner, thus pointing out a path of pleasantness and peace through this vale of wo. It opens a vista through the skies, to the mansions of ceaseless rest, and endless joy. Cherish then this last, best gift of Heaven—Let your conduct be influenced by the sacred word. Lay hold on the hope which is set before you. Honour your profession by a well ordered life and conversation, and your God by your gratitude and devotion. And may God crown your lives with peace, and your souls with salvation.

Done by order,
ALFRED PECK, *Clerk.*

ILLUSTRATION OF 1 JOHN, ii. 18, 19.

"*Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that anti-christ shall come, even now are there many anti-christs; whereby we know it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.*"

In the last number of the Gospel Advocate, we find the following notice from the Publisher, in relation to the Editor of that paper. It is in relation to an event which we have, for some time, been prepared for, and have expected, however unpleasant it may be to our feelings. We hope and fervently pray that, so far from weakening the faith, discouraging the hearts, or relaxing the exertions of the friends of revelation, christianity, and Universalism, it will serve as a beacon to all to be on their guard against such fatal delusion, stimulate them to watchfulness over themselves, and faithfulness in the discharge of all their relative and social duties; that the world may know that the rejection and firm opposition to bigotry, intolerance and fanaticism, on the one hand, does not lead to the opposite extreme of infidelity and hostility to all religion, on the other hand. After all, however, we cannot —charity will not allow us to—look upon the course taken by Mr. Brownson in any other light than that of its being the result of mental alienation: Our reasons for believing so will be given hereafter if necessary. Hence, looking upon him in this light, we cannot but sincerely pity him, and most deeply sympathize with his unfortunate family, in the event. —*Evangelical Magazine.*

ADVOCATE AND INVESTIGATOR.

"EARNESTLY CONTEND FOR THE FAITH."

We have published one sermon in this number, and shall publish another in our next, from the former editor of the Gospel Advocate, Rev. L. S. Everett, who is not yet ashamed to be called an Universalist. They will be read with interest by all our subscribers, and especially by the early patrons of the Advocate.

U. F. D.

The minutes of the Genesee Association have but just been received, owing chiefly to the ill-health of Br. Peck, who was appointed to prepare them for publication. Previous to receiving the minutes, &c. furnished by Br. Peck, our compositors had put in type the minutes and an explanatory letter from brother Sadler, which we have let stand in the Advocate, and added the General Epistle furnished by Br. Peck.

TO OUR AGENTS AND PATRONS.

Our next number will close the 7th vol. of the Advocate. We wish our Agents to make returns as early as possible, and request every subscriber who is in arrears to pay the amount due to a responsible Agent, or forward the same to us by mail without delay. If we send Circulars to our Agents and Subscribers an expense of postage will be incurred which might as well be avoided. After the first of January the Advocate will be united with the Magazine and published by Brother Skinner at Utica. We shall have no pecuniary interest in the new paper, but we most heartily wish it success, and hope all the Agents and friends of the Advocate will obtain for it as many good subscribers as possible. It will be afforded remarkably cheap, considering the quantity of matter, and will therefore require an extensive list of subscribers to sustain it. It is a time when such papers ought to be sustained by all liberal-minded men, and especially by all Universalists. Orthodoxy is making exertions to obtain uncontrolled dominion, and not only are our religious rights in danger, but our civil liberties are threatened. A crisis is approaching. To guard against danger *means* must be used; the Press must be employed; and we are not afraid to promise that the "Evangelical Magazine & Gospel Advocate," will pre-

sent a powerful barrier against religious usurpation. Every additional responsible subscriber will encourage the heart and strengthen the hands of the publisher, and contribute something to the support of civil and religious liberty. U. F. D.

It is with reluctance that we further notice O. A. Brownson. He has a perfect right to believe or profess whatsoever doctrines he pleases, and however we may differ with him in sentiment, we would by no means injure him, or any man, on account of his opinions. But society has other and higher claims. Every man is bound to be sincere and honest in his professions, and especially to be fair and honourable in his business transactions. We do not think Mr. Brownson is entirely sane. If he be so we consider his conduct more censurable than any errour in speculative opinions.

When in Utica in September last he pledged his honour in case the Advocate was sold to Br. Skinner, not to be concerned in publishing a similar work, calculated to interfere with the interests of the Advocate, in two years, and that he would *do nothing* to *injure* the Advocate in the hands of brother Skinner, but would do all he could to benefit it. He now says that he considers the Free Enquirer a publication entirely different from the Advocate and that he had it in his mind at the time he made the pledge to become connected with the Enquirer. But if the Enquirer is not calculated to interfere with the interests of the Advocate, why does he call by publick advertisements, on the readers of the latter to patronise the former? Why has he attempted to *sell*, to Miss Frances Wright, for a stipulated price the patrons of the Advocate? Is it honest to sell the same property to different persons? He never was the owner of the Advocate. The present publisher paid a thousand dollars for it, and at B's urgent solicitation, when he had scarce any other means of support, hired him, at a liberal salary, to devote a portion of his time in editing it. After we had sold it with his consent and approbation, to brother Skinner, was it honest in him to sell it to the Free Enquirer, or attempt to turn its patronage into other channels? And if he intended when at Utica to become connected with the Free Enquirer, to renounce all connection with Universalism and Christianity, and to deny that we have any evidence of the existence of a God or any superiour intelligent Power, was it honest to go into Universalist meeting Houses, and accept of contributions, and lift up his hands and his voice in solemn prayer *to God*, and preach from the language of Jesus?

If he be perfectly sane, his conduct certainly admits of no justification. As connected with this subject, we copy the following remarks from the Trumpet and Magazine, published at Boston.

"ORESTES A. BROWNSON.

"Frances Wright has announced, in the "Free Enquirer" for the 7th inst. that Mr. O. A. BROWNSON, has "*held out to her the hand of fellowship, and become attached to the Free Enquirer.*" We find also, in the columns of that paper, that it is "published weekly at 359 Broome-street, New-York, by Wright, Owen and Jennings, Editors and proprietors,—and *at Auburn, State of New-York, by* O. A. BROWNSON, *corresponding Editor*." Miss Wright further says of Mr. B., that "until a few weeks since she had no personal intercourse with him whatever;" that he has now "dropped from the clouds upon the solid earth;" all the patrons of the Gospel Advocate "who love truth better than their sect," are informed that Mr. B. "reckons upon their support" in his new career; and all his friends who remit their names to the "Free Enquirer," "are requested to state that they appertain to Mr. Brownson's list of subscribers, as this regards the *pecuniary interest of that gentleman.*" It would seem from this that O. A. Brownson has renounced Christianity, embraced the sentiments of Miss Wright and the other Editors of the "Free Enquirer," and is now about to enter heart and hand into the promulgation of those opinions.

"Neither Mr. Brownson, nor any other man, nor woman, is to be condemned for the avowal of belief, nor should any person suffer any injury whatsoever on that account. This we cheerfully allow. Nevertheless, Miss Wright's article is calculated to leave a wrong impression, which we think it our duty to correct.—She says, that Mr. B. *in consequence* of holding out to her the hand of fellowship, "has relinquished the charge of the Gospel Advocate." This, we believe, is a mistake. The Gospel Advocate was sold some time *before* Mr. B. professed to renounce Christianity, and *he* knew that his services as editor of that work, were very soon to end. We would inquire, whence arose his spite against the Gospel Advocate? He is now about to attempt to *run it down.* Miss Wright in his behalf, invites all the patrons of that paper "who love truth better than their sect," to subscribe for the 'Free Enquirer,' her own paper; and they are requested to signify that they were formerly patrons of the Advocate, as "this regards the *pecuniary interests* of that gentleman." Whence arose Mr. Brownson's spite against the Advocate, but because he foresaw that it was already, in effect, out of his hands?

"It is very difficult for us to account for Mr. Brownson's late course on the principles of *sincerity* and *truth.* We have endeavoured, in our own minds, to clear him from the charge of *deception*, but have altogether failed. A few weeks ago he came to this city. We knew that his connexion with the Advocate was about to cease, and we heard that the Universalist Society in Auburn had discontinued his labours. We supposed he came to this neighbourhood, the focus of Universalism, to find employment. He said nothing of his having renounced his belief in a God, or of the Christian Religion. He was invited to preach in

some of the Universalist Meeting Houses here, and he *prayed to God*, and preached *from the words of Jesus Christ*. Collections were taken up for him in two of our churches, to the amount of 30 or 40 dollars. He avowed to a friend his wish to obtain a settlement as a christian minister. Just before he left this neighbourhood, as we are informed by a friend, he expressed his determination to go to Hartford, Conn. and endeavour to become joint editor of the Religious Inquirer, with Br. Menzies Rayner; that, if he did not succeed there, he should return to the West, and sit himself down to study, for the purpose of making himself a more acceptable preacher, and of rendering himself more useful in the christian cause. Under these circumstances he leaves us for the West, and the next we hear of him is, that he "held out to Miss Wright the hand of fellowship, and offered to serve the cause of truth (*alias* the doctrines of the "Free Enquirer") under its own colours." This is the point of view in which the Universalists in this neighbourhood are compelled to look on Mr. Brownson. We can now make an application of the proverb we heard him utter in our office, concerning men's being "*as honest as the times would admit.*" Miss Wright will not wonder that we smile, when she calls on all the patrons of the "Gospel Advocate" who love *truth* better than their sect, to follow Mr. Brownson. Free inquiry after truth we desire to venerate in any person, whatever may be his opinions; but *craft* and *hypocrisy* it is our duty to disapprove."

On Mr. B's return from Boston, he called on brother Skinner at Utica, and offered his services in conducting the Magazine and Gospel Advocate. Br. S. knowing his instability felt unwilling to engage him. This was on *Monday*. The same evening he attended Miss Wright's lecture, and on *Tuesday*, the next day, "*held out to her the hand of fellowship and became attached to the Free Enquirer.*" To say that this *sudden conversion* was the result of conviction on hearing Miss Wright's lecture, is inadmissible, because he was previously well acquainted with her sentiments and writings.

As respects the office of the Free Enquirer at Auburn, it is altogether *fictitious*. No such paper is to be printed in this place, nor is there any such office here except an imaginary one. Mr. Brownson is not here, nor is he likely to be much of the time. The last we heard of him he was in Genoa, lecturing to *very thin* houses, in favour of industry and the new system of knowledge. Could we once see the implements of honest industry in his own hands, we should deem him more consistent. But let it be observed, people will go to meetings of some kind, and if Universalists discontinue theirs, the preachers of endless misery will soon gain the ascendancy, and lord it over the people, and not unlikely succeed in undermining our civil institutions. We must reject all wild visionary projects and take a course consistent with prudence and common sense, if we calculate to withstand them.

We will add, that we, as well as Mr. Brownson, were bound by honourable pledge, to do nothing to injure the purchase of brother Skinner, and it was in fulfilment of this pledge that we felt compelled to cut off Mr. Brownson's connection with the Advocate, after he became "attached to the Free Enquirer."

We now call on all liberal minded men, to weigh the matter well, and judge whether they can contend successfully against "Orthodoxy" under the banners of an enthusiastick female, who denies all evidence of the existence of a God, discards all natural and revealed religion, advocates a community of goods, by which the industrious and frugal, would be compelled to support the idle and dissipated, and whose principles whatever she may profess, would necessarily lead to an indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes. Think well of the subject before you discard the liberal and consoling doctrine of Universalism, under which you were making good progress against religious bigotry and intolerance, to embrace the wild chimeras of *foreigners* incapable of appreciating our situation or the genius of our institutions. You cannot fail to see that the latter course will render you odious and powerless, and enable the self-styled Orthodox to tread on you with impunity; whilst, by another somerset, it is not at all unlikely you will find in the Orthodox ranks the very person, who has attempted to sell you to the Free Enquirer.

U. F. DOUBLEDAY.

SELECTIONS.

[From the Evangelical Magazine,]

BR. SKINNER—By the politeness of a friend, I have been furnished with the following "ARTICLES OF FAITH," and having frequently, not only in my public discourses, but likewise in private conversations, had occasion to notice some part of the same, and having *as* frequently been *disputed*, and accused by the advocates of the system, of base *misrepresentation*, I have deemed it, therefore, not only *prudent*, but *proper*, to solicit its insertion in your paper. In doing thus, it is believed that you will benefit, not only many who are within the pale of the church, and at the same time, *partially*, if not *totally ignorant* of the doctrines to which they have subscribed, but also a certain class who are halting between two opinions, in consequence of the want of a *correct knowledge* of *orthodox* sentiments.

It is well known that the religious community at present is in commotion. A spirit of candid inquiry is now performing its powerful operations upon the intellectual faculties of a free and independent people; and it is seriously hoped that it may not cease its operations till the *insanity* and every wild *symptom* of *Finneyism*, together with the BURNING *inflammation* of Calvinism, is forever driven from the human intellect, and men once more become blessed with those ideas which flow from the

proper use of that *reason* which God has in mercy bestowed upon his intelligent creation.

The time has now arrived, in which those *religious creeds* which have for so long a time been *ignorantly* and *tacitly* received, and blindly and strenuously advocated, are to pass the ordeal of reasonable investigation; and it is earnestly desired, that, into whose hands soever the following may chance to fall, it may be read with candour and impartiality, and tested by *reason* and *revelation*, the only sure criterion.

J. CHASE, Jr.

Marcellus, Nov. 10, 1829.

ARTICLES OF FAITH

Adopted by the Presbytery of Niagara, and recommended to the Churches under their care.

(A verbatim copy.)

Article 1. We believe there is one only living and true God, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, subsisting in a mysterious and incomprehensible manner in three persons, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the same in substance, and in all divine attributes equal.

Art. 2. We believe that God is the creator and governor of the universe, that he has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, and that in his providence he works all things according to his own infinitely wise, holy, and eternal purpose.

Art. 3. We believe that the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, and that they are a perfect rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him.

Art. 4. We believe that our first parents were created in the image of God, perfectly holy, and that, being left to the freedom of their own will, they fell from their happy state by transgressing the divine command.

Art. 5. We believe that, in consequence of the fall of our first parents, ALL MANKIND, *by nature*, are destitute of holiness, and are WHOLLY inclined to [all*] moral evil, and that, on account of sin, they are justly [exposed*] to all the miseries of *this* life, to *death itself*, and to the PAINS OF HELL FOREVER.

Art. 6. We believe that Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, who being GOD THE SON —equal with the Father in all the perfections of the God-head has taken upon him *human nature*, AND SUFFERED AND DIED FOR MEN, and by his *obedience* and *death*, has made an atonement for sin—that God can now be *just*, and *justify* him that believeth in Jesus, and that all who are saved will be wholly indebted for salvation to the *sovereign grace of God*, through his atonement.

Art. 7. We believe that, in consequence of the atonement of Christ, the offer of life in the *gospel*, *is made* TO ALL, and that *whosoever will*, *may* take of the water of life *freely*, yet that *such is the depravity* of mankind, that they WILL NOT repent of sin, and believe in Christ, and become reconciled to God, *except they are renewed* by the Holy Ghost.

Art. 8. We believe that from *eternity*, God has *chosen* a seed from among men to *serve him*, whom he has *given to Christ* in the covenant of redemption, and whom he *will* bring home to his kingdom from among all nations, and *make* to be the praise of the glory of his *grace* —that as many as are *ordained* to eternal life, WILL believe, and NEVER come into condemnation, but through *watchfulness* and *prayer*, will be *kept by the power of God* through *faith*, unto salvation.

Art. 9. We believe that God has a *church* in the world, consisting of such as are friends and followers of Jesus Christ, and having entered into explicit covenant with each other to comply with all the commandments of the great head of the church, that *they*, and *they only*, *have a right* to all the ordinances of *Christ's house*.

Art. 10. We believe in the divine appointment of the CHRISTIAN SABBATH, and of the ordinances of baptism, and the Lord's Supper, which Christians are under solemn obligations duly to observe, and that christian parents are bound to dedicate their households to God in baptism, *and to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.*

Art. 11. We believe that the soul is immortal—that at *death*, believers are made *perfectly holy*, and do *immediately* pass into glory.

Art. 12. We believe that there will be a general *resurrection* of the *bodies*, both of the *just* and the *unjust*.

Art. 13. We believe there will be a *Day of Judgement*, when all must stand before the Son of Man, and receive a sentence of *just* and *final retribution*, according to the deeds done in the body—that the wicked shall go away into ENDLESS PUNISHMENT, but the *righteous* into *life eternal*.

Concerning the many *blunders*, gross *absurdities*, and *palpable contradictions*, with which the above "*articles of faith*" abound, I shall at present remain silent, confidently believing that all who read, will be at once compelled, not only to see, but to confess them. J. C.

[From the Salina Herald.]

We now give what appeared at the time with regard to the SECRET CIRCULAR of 1825, urging a national religion, which was a few weeks since republished in our paper, as one of the items of evidence adduced by those who charge upon leading *Presbyterians* a de-

* We have ventured to insert the words included in brackets, supposing they must belong there, altho' they were not in the copy furnished by our correspondent. We conclude he must have made an omission in transcribing. If we are wrong, he will please correct us.—*Ed. Magazine.*

sign of uniting *Church* and *State* in this country.

The thing, it seems, was a printed circular Letter, sent simultaneously into different parts of the United States, through the post-office. At the bottom of the Letter was this injunction or request, viz.: "It is requested that this circular may be communicated to such only as have *similar views*, as the distribution of it has been limited."

Among those to whom it was sent, were it seems several who had *not similar views*, and they sent the thing to such editors of papers as they knew had not similar views to those avowed in the circular, and would dare to expose to the world the secret plans and views of such as had. And these editors, to whom they were finally sent, did publish and expose them.

The Editor of the Cayuga Patriot stated that he had received it through the *post-office* at *Albany*. The Editor of the Reformer, Philadelphia, at the same time stated that he received his from a *post-master in Ohio*. The Editor of the Columbian Star, a *Baptist* paper under the direction of the faculty of the *Baptist College*, at the city of *Washington*, when he gave it to the publick, stated that he did not know from whom or from whence it came.

This paper of the Baptist college at the city of Washington, after remarking that the object of the Circular appeared to be, to produce a gradual union and amalgamation of all religions —to establish a national creed—make one form of *national religion*—have the national government *educate* and *pay* the *national clergy*—the clergy adopting a *national costume*, and that the authors of the secret Circular had forgot to mention the blessings of *Popes*, *Cardinals*, and *inquisitions*, &c. remarks as follows: "It is well for christians, and especially for *Baptists*, to observe the signs of the times. There may be *more cause* to apprehend a *powerful effort*, at no distant day, to establish a *national religion* in this country, than we are accustomed to suppose."

The paper in Philadelphia published by a Methodist in sentiment, when it published the Circular, cautioned the Methodists against being gulled by the artful inducements held out in the plot to bring them in. And the other paper above mentioned, which received the secret circular from the Albany post-office, and such others as copied it from them, urged the country at large to be on the look out against the secret plot that appeared to be thus in agitation.

There appeared to be no evidence but *circumstantial*, that the circular originated with the Presbyterian clergy. That sect had then established the *national* Bible society, and got the *national* Bible house built at New-York, procuring what money and aid they could from Baptists and Methodists to build it—were then, 1825, establishing a *national Tract society* and building a house for that, procuring what aid they could from Methodists and Baptists for that also. At the same period, the Rev. Dr. Beecher, Rev. Dr. Griffin, Rev. Dr. Ely, and others of that sect, were ardently engaged in raising large funds to educate a great number of ministers. Dr. Griffin had stated to one society in New-York, that *seven hundred thousand clergymen* were wanted—it was therefore supposed that they would want at least some help from Congress or the *national government* to educate, clothe and pay such a number. About the same time, a sermon preached by the Rev. Mr. Weeks, another Presbyterian minister, was circulated, in which he openly advocated the adoption of the system of TYTHES to pay clergymen, and the necessity and propriety of government providing for them. These, and various other circumstances at the time, conspired to create, it is believed, a general belief then, that the secret circular originated with some of the Presbyterian clergymen.

These being some of the circumstances which at the time led to a belief that it originated with them, circumstances since that time, have not tended to lessen that impression with those who believed it before. Their taking the lead in the *union* of the pioneer line of stages—the lead in the *union* of effort before Congress to stop the mail from running on Sunday, &c. have all had a tendency to fasten those impressions. And nothing is hazarded in saying that a very great proportion of the people now consider that, should they effect that law, it would be the entering wedge to effect the commencement of a union of church and state, or a national religion.

The most uncharitable, probably, never supposed that a majority of their clergy knew any thing of such a project of a national religion; or supposed, perhaps, that one to ten of their lay members or communicants were, as yet, let into the secret views of some of their leading clergymen.

The circumstantial evidence that it did not originate with the Baptist sect was, that, as soon as that establishment of the Baptist college at the city of Washington got hold of the circular, they exposed the project to community, and warned their brethren not to be caught by the gilded bait—and just about that period, the whole of the Southern Baptist associations, we understand, without an exception, in North Carolina, Georgia and South Carolina, if not Tennessee, came out and revolted from all these monied schemes of the day; declaring that these monied societies, Missionary, Bible, Tract and Education associations, were not the gospel plan of salvation —were not the authorized bible mode of spreading the gospel abroad, and were in danger of destroying all true religion at home,—going so far, if we recollect right, as to excom-

municate some of their members who would not let go their worship to this *mammon* and mammouth of *unrighteousness*, as they called these enormous societies for the collection of money. Nor had the Baptists of the North nor the Methodists in any part of the Union, been the first to go forward in any of these projects of the day—therefore none of them were suspected of writing the circular. And as all the arguments urged therein were just such as those in favour of a national religion, clothing and feeding the clergy by government, &c. would be likely to use in its favour, no one could attribute it to an enemy to these sects thrown out to create suspicions in community against them. The arguments in favour of a national religion were too many and too artfully introduced and arranged all in favour of the measure, for such a conclusion as that.

Therefore, for these reasons, suspicion did then, and does still, rest upon some of the ambitious and aspiring Presbyterian clergy before mentioned—with how much propriety, God best knows; and the publick, on examining all the facts and circumstances, can best judge.

SUNDAY MAILS.—We have a new and important idea on this subject. It is one which we have found in some newspaper lately. It is this. Let those who are opposed to the transmission of the mails, on Sunday, write on the wrapper of whatever they deposit in them, "*not to be forwarded on the Sabbath.*" In this case all their communications would lie still on that day; for the Post Master General, no doubt, would order their *conscientious* requests to be respected by all his deputies. This is a free country, and the wishes of every citizen should be regarded by the government as far as possible. If this suggestion is practised, those who are opposed to the transmission of the mail on the Sabbath would not have *their* consciences violated by any thing which they have done to cause it to travel on that day; while those who deem it important that their letters and papers should come to them, or go to others from them, as much sooner as a Sabbath day's journey would facilitate them, can also have *their* wishes accomplished. Let every man be conscientious for himself—not for others. The disposition manifested by some men to regulate other's consciences by their own has occasioned infinite mischief in the world.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

REV. CLEMENT F. LE FEVRE.—This gentleman, of whom honourable mention was made in our last numbers, is, as we learn from the following, on his way to this city.

"The editor on his return from the north, had an interview with the Rev. Clement Fall Le Fevre, late Rector of Sherbrook, L. C.—He was on his way to New-York, with his wife and three children. Br. Le Fevre was ordained by the present Archbishop of Canterbury, and is a son of Rev. George Le Fevre, of Pembroke College, Oxford, and for some years past connected with the British embassy, at Paris, in the character of Chaplain.

Br. Le Fevre informed me that he was summoned before the Bishop residing at Quebec, to "answer for himself touching those things whereof he had been accused," and was questioned respecting his views of the Trinity, &c. His answers were such as to satisfy the clergy and deacons who examined him that he could no longer remain in their fellowship. He has letters in his possession from the Bishop and other clergy which bear testimony to his piety and good talents.

He has been preaching the doctrine of Universal benevolence in Sherbrook, a few months past, and his candid arguments, and correct deportment, have convinced his hearers of the truth of his sentiments. The neighbouring clergy foreseeing that his influence would extend to their parishes, agreed to purchase his house, furniture, and land, (for which he received a thousand pounds) on condition that he should leave the province. He accepted the proposal."—*Watchman.*

SABBATH LAWS.

[*From the Mechanicks' Free Press.*]

A LAWFUL OUTRAGE.—On the Sunday preceeding the 4th of July, an occurrence took place in my neighbourhood of a singular nature.

A labouring man who is employed a few miles below the city, at farming, returned on Saturday evening to pass the Sunday with his family, as his custom was. In the night the rain fell in torrents, filling every cavity with water that it had access to. In the morning the family found themselves shut in by a pond of water that had collected in the passage to the street, which passage is enclosed on both sides by high board fences, so that there was no passing to the street except through the water. However the wife forded the pond and procured bread and milk at the risk of her health. The man, on complaint of his wife, went out to examine the obstruction—not liking to have the communication cut off from the street, or subject himself and family to wade the pond, got an instrument and knocked off as many boards near the house as would enable them to pass into the next yard, and thro' it to the street, upon dry ground. Before the offender could get off on Monday morning to his work, one of his over zealous neighbours had him apprehended, and brought before a magistrate, and fined for "*Sabbath breaking,*" according to law.

Now, gentle reader, what do you think the law required of the labouring man for the offence, after the complainant had relinquished his part of the fine? Five dollars and fifty

cents, cost included! being within fifty cents of a whole week's wages—and no part of the fine was relinquished until one of the neighbours cried shame on it. If this is one of the mild and merciful laws of this magnanimous Republick, I wish it abolished and another made, more agreeable to the spirit of our national constitution.

CONSIDERATION.—Some of our friends of late have suggested the expediency and propriety of devoting one or two pages of the *Magazine and Advocate*, after the 1st of January next, to political news, and items of general intelligence. Perhaps this might suit a majority of our subscribers, as it would save them the expense of taking a political paper; as we should give the most important and general news of the day; though we should by no means mingle in the contests of the various and conflicting political partizans. If our friends will generally express their views upon this subject, (i. e. allowing they have any choice as to the course we shall take in reference to it,) we will conform to the wishes of the majority.—*Evangelical Magazine.*

[From the Trumpet and Magazine.]

When Robinson Crusoe saw the print of a human foot in the sand upon his island, his common sense told him that it had not always been there, and that it was not made by chance. Wherever we go, we see the footsteps of God. The heavens declare his glory, and the firmament sheweth forth his handy work. All the works of nature manifest his existence.

"In *reason's* ear they all rejoice,
And utter forth a glorious voice;
Forever singing as they shine
"The hand that made us is divine."

Br. RAYNER of Hartford, cannot readily believe, that the account Miss Wright has published concerning O. A. Brownson, is correct; since Mr. B. avowed to him, only one week before the date of Miss Wright's statement, "*his decided belief in the truth of Christianity, and his unequivocal disapprobation of the doctrines of the Free Enquirer, so far as they related to the subject of religion.*"—Trumpet & Mag

---

ORIGINAL ANECDOTE.—Rev. C. G. Finney while at Reading, Pa. called upon a woman living in that borough, and as is his usual custom, told her she was going to hell—well, said the lady, I am busy at present—but as I shall probably meet you there, we shall have time enough to talk upon the subject.

AN IMPOSTOR.

The P. M. at Perrysburgh, (O.) has kindly communicated to us the following particulars relating to a person whose right name we believe is *P. A. Day.* He has been engaged in collecting pay for the Advocate and receiving pay in advance for the Magazine and Advocate. We understand he has been in the habit of obtaining subscribers for various publications, and pocketing the advance pay without making any return to the publishers. His knowledge of the affairs of the Advocate must have been obtained partly from our published list of Agents, and partly by enquiries in the vicinity of places where the papers are taken. He has been a preacher for some time. Whether ever in fellowship with any association, we know not.

PERRYSBURGH, (O.) Nov. 28, 1829.

Dear Sir: Since writing to you on the subject of the person of Mr. Willis, I have learnt more about him, enough to know for a certainty that he is an *impostor.* In Michigan he is represented to have passed by different names, at one place *Day*, and another *Brooks*, and at this place Willis.

I have written to my friends along the Lake shore to *beware;* and I sincerely hope our brethren eastward may not be so easily imposed upon as we have been in this quarter.

His person is that of a middling size, *dark* complexion, plain and frank in his address, age about thirty; has some smattering knowledge of *Latin*, *Greek*, and *Hebrew*,—has a perfect knowledge of all our societies, and preachers in connection; knows all about the Advocate office; who the subscribers are; and how much they are in arrears—but as a preacher, a perfect *Ignoramus.*

I am really anxious to know who this person can be; his knowledge is such that he must have either been a preacher in the connection, or a clerk in the office of some of our publications, I should suppose he must have been employed in the Advocate office or Magazine at Utica; otherwise I cannot account for his knowledge of the subscribers to the Advocate in this part of the country. He told me of subscribers which I obtained, which no person could know except from themselves, or from the office.

Whatever information you may have, or obtain on this subject, please communicate, and urge Mr. Skinner to do the same.

Yours truly,
J. HOLLISTER.

U. F. DOUBLEDAY.

☞ Our subscribers are advised that we have no *general* or *travelling* Agents who are authorised to collect money due for the Advocate. We have reason to fear that some of our subscribers (in the western states,) while intending to pay money to us, have placed it in the hands of impostors.

Will some one of our subscribers at Bellefonte, Ala. inform us, why none of them have paid for the three last volumes of the Advocate?

The following relating to a preacher's notions of what a *good man* is, is very reasonable and correct.

"I was diverted to hear you describe what you called a '*good man.*' The first requisite was, *prayer in his family;* the second, *keeping 'holy time,'* and the third, *uniform attention to public worship.* The bitterest enemies of our Saviour were *good men* according to these rules. Saul of Tarsus, full of rage and of the spirit of persecution, was probably one of *your good men;* and if you are actuated by any better spirit, you have never given evidence of it. Our Saviour, if he were upon earth now, would direct his reproof against those clergy, who are violently opposed to impartial benevolence.—You completely sustain the character of the Pharisee, whether you know it or not."

In a late publication, Mr. Brownson says "I do not renounce my former religious belief" &c. This is very disingenuous and uncandid. It is an insult to the understanding of his readers. Those who have watched his course cannot fail to have observed his policy in using language that will admit of several constructions. He always furnishes what may not inaptly be termed trap-doors, through which he may escape in case of difficulty. From the above assertion we might charge him with being still an Universalists, but it rests with us to prove that he ever did believe in Universalism. And here he has a chance to escape from the conclusion that would naturally flow from his own language, or take the benefit of such conclusion, which ever may happen to suit his present or future convenience. But he has another lurking place where he will generally conceal himself. When asked whether he believes in universal salvation, in the immortality of the soul, the truth of Christianity or the existence of a God, he will say that he "has no *more* than five senses," and "assumes not to *believe or disbelieve* ought that is said of worlds or beings not cognizable by the powers of the human mind." Again, why has he not renounced his former belief? Because he neither believes nor disbelieves! He can also say, true I have changed my belief, but have not *renounced* it. Why not renounce it? Because he supposes *duplicity* may yet be somewhat useful to him. Formerly he professed to be a Christian Preacher. Now he does not profess to believe in the existence of a God—no; he pretends that he neither believes nor disbelieves it. Still he uses language calculated to convey to many an idea that he has not changed his sentiments. Are equivocation and duplicity proper instruments to use in promoting the cause of "TRUTH?" No; they are as inconsistent with *rational* "free enquiry" as they are with common honesty. U. F. D.

UNION OF PAPERS.

NEW ARRANGEMENT.

A weekly paper for One Dollar and Fifty cents.

The EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE, now in progress of the Third Volume at Utica, and GOSPEL ADVOCATE, now in progress of the Seventh Volume at Auburn, will on the 1st of January, 1830, be *united*, and published at Utica, N. Y. under the title of

Evangelical Magazine

AND GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

The MAGAZINE AND ADVOCATE will be published every Saturday, on fine white paper and good type, on a full sheet medium, in quarto form,—or, on a very large imperial half sheet, which shall contain, by close printing, an equal quantity of matter to a whole medium sheet, and its pages about the same size;—8 pages in each number, 416 in the volume, with a complete Index at the close of the year. The volume will contain just twice as much matter as a volume of the Magazine now does, and at least one third more than the Advocate now does.

PRICE $1 50 *in advance*, or $2 if not paid in advance or within three months from the time the first No. is received. Agents who obtain *eight* subscribers, and become responsible for them, (or companies paying for eight copies,) will be allowed the *ninth copy gratis;* and in the same proportion for a greater number. No subscriptions received for a less time than one year, (unless the money be paid in advance,) and no paper discontinued till all arrearages are paid. Universalist Ministers, and Post Masters friendly to the objects of this publication, are requested to act as agents. All communications to the Editor and Publisher must be *post-paid*, or *free.*

Subscribers' names to be forwarded previous to the first of January, if practicable, or as soon thereafter as convenient, to

DOLPHUS SKINNER, *Utica, N. Y.*

Or if more convenient for the present patrons of the Advocate, names and remittances may be forwarded to *U. F. Doubleday, Auburn.*

☞ *The Gospel Advocate and Impartial Investigator is published every other Saturday, by* U. F. DOUBLEDAY, *(to whom all letters and communications must be addressed,* post paid,) *at* $1 50 *per annum, payable in advance, to be increased to* $2 00, *if not paid within six months.*

DOUBLEDAY & ALLEN, PRINTERS.